

*Volume VI]*

*April, 1901*

[*Number 3*]

The  
**American Historical Review**

THE MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION AT DETROIT AND ANN ARBOR

THE sixteenth annual meeting of the American Historical Association was held on December 27, 28 and 29, the middle day being devoted to sessions at Ann Arbor, the rest of the time spent at Detroit. Perhaps no meeting has ever been so successful in the general promotion of mutual acquaintance. To a larger extent than usual the members were gathered under one roof. Nearly all the sessions were held under that same roof, the hotel having an adequate convention hall. Detroit itself, though handsome and attractive, and abundantly hospitable, did not present, to savants who being human are prone to wander, those distractions which are presented by larger cities; perhaps, indeed, a city of the second size, with a university near by, affords the best place for meetings of such an association. However this may be, certain it is that a large number of members were present, and found much pleasure in social intercourse with their fellow-members and with the members of the American Economic Association, which met at the same time and place, though with another hotel as its headquarters. It was noticeable that a large number of young men were present, whose obvious interest and serious devotion to their professional work were constantly gratifying. General and Mrs. Russell A. Alger received the members, with cordial hospitality, on the Thursday afternoon; "smokers" were given by the University Club and the Detroit Club in the evenings; and the ladies attending were entertained by Mrs. George O. Robinson. By the kindness of citizens of Michigan, a special train was provided which conveyed the members to and from Ann Arbor, where they were hospitably entertained to luncheon by President Angell and other members of the faculty of the University of Michigan. The university provided rooms for the sessions of Friday. That of Thursday evening, at which

the presiding officers of the two associations read their addresses, was held in the First Methodist Church of Detroit. That all the arrangements were carried out so smoothly, and resulted in so much pleasure to those who attended, is due to the faithful preparatory work of the local committee of arrangements, and primarily to its chairman, Professor Earle W. Dow, of the University of Michigan. It is the more proper to record the obligations of the Association to him because he was not seen at any of the sessions, owing to illness largely caused by his devotion to this very task. For the skillful construction of the programme, composed of elements unusually varied yet so associated as to avoid all appearance of scrappiness, the Association is mainly indebted to the chairman of its committee on the programme, Professor Andrew C. McLaughlin of the same university, who was assisted in this work by Professors Robinson, Turner, E. G. Bourne and Judson, and Mr. A. Howard Clark.

The great success of the meeting was the more remarkable when it is remembered how many were ill of those upon whom the Association and the committee had relied as officers and speakers. The President, Dr. Edward Eggleston, was unexpectedly prevented by illness from appearing; and the Second Vice-President was then unable to take his place. The First Vice-President, Professor Moses Coit Tyler, died at Ithaca during the time of the sessions. Expressions of sorrow over his loss were frequent and genuine. Much of the best of his work had been done at Ann Arbor. He was one of the founders of the Association, one of its chief ornaments, and one who worthily filled the place of an elder brother in a profession still young in our country. Many of the members of the Association had had occasion to appreciate not only his learning, the grace of his style and the charm of his conversation, but his personal tact and friendly courtesy, and the kindness and warmth of his heart. Continued ill-health caused the resignation, at this meeting, of Professor Herbert B. Adams of Baltimore, Secretary of the Association from the time of its foundation in 1884. He had had a most important, and indeed probably the leading share in its organization, and had borne the principal part in the arrangement of its first eleven meetings. His constant and devoted services to the Association were gratefully noted in private, and publicly commemorated by a formal minute of the Association and by his election to the office of First Vice-President. Illness prevented two or three of the speakers from appearing, though in one case the paper was read by a friend. The duty of presiding was acceptably performed by two ex-presidents, Dr. James Ford

Rhodes and President James B. Angell of the University, and by Hon. Peter White, a member of the Council.

Aside from the business meeting, there were six sessions of the Association. One of these was devoted to the inaugural addresses; one was a joint session held with the American Economic Association. Of the remaining four, one was given to the history of the Crusades and of the East, one to the Church History Section, one to Western history, and one was divided between British history and that of the United States.

In the session devoted to the Crusades and the East, the first paper was one which Professor George L. Burr of Cornell University had been requested to prepare, on the Year One Thousand and the Antecedents of the First Crusade, in general review of the modern discussions and the present state of knowledge. This paper appears as the next article to this, in the present number of this REVIEW. After it, Professor Oliver J. Thatcher of the University of Chicago read a carefully prepared and instructive survey of the modern Critical Work on the Sources for the First Crusade. Beginning with Ranke's seminary of 1837 and Sybel's book of 1841, he traced the history of the discussion, and described the Latin sources of the first rank—the letters of the crusaders and the eye-witness accounts by the anonymous Italian, Raymond of Agiles, Fulcher of Chartres, and Tudebod—and those of the second rank, coming from writers who, like Ekkehard and Radulf, went out to the Holy Land soon after the date of this crusade. He then gave a brief account of the ways in which the modern process of shifting emphasis from the secondary to the primary sources has reconstituted our narrative of the First Crusade—the relegating of Peter the Hermit to the background, the exalting of Pope Urban, the partial discrediting of the leaders—and of the causes which had brought about the original distortion.

President Angell of the University of Michigan, formerly ambassador to Turkey, read the paper upon the Capitulations in Turkey which appeared in our last issue (pp. 254-259). In discussion of Dr. Thatcher's paper, Professor Archibald C. Coolidge of Harvard University dwelt especially upon the important relations of the Crusades to the Eastern Church and Empire and to Asiatic history in general, and upon the Byzantine sources for their history. Dr. Alfred L. P. Dennis, instructor at Harvard, by request described, both with respect to the Crusades and in more general aspects, the Oriental portion of the library of the late Count Riant. This half of his collections has been presented to the library of Harvard University, while the Scandinavian section has been presented to Yale.

The morning session ended with the appointment of the following committees by the chair: on finance, Hon. Elbridge T. Gerry and Mr. George S. Bowdoin; on audit, Messrs. Bryant Walker and Andrew McF. Davis; on nominations, Professors H. P. Judson, George L. Burr and Victor Coffin; on resolutions, Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin, Professor James A. Woodburn and Professor John M. Vincent.

The public session of the Church History Section, presided over by its secretary, Rev. Dr. Samuel Macauley Jackson, was well attended. The first paper was by Professor George James Bayles, of Columbia University, and was entitled *American Ecclesiology*. His subject was not ecclesiology in the narrower sense of architectural antiquities, but in general that branch of social history which has to do with religion in America. The chief data were: a limited individual action for the purposes of religion, a limited co-operative action for the same, and a limited creation of corporation law. Throughout our history there had been an enlargement of the scope of individual and voluntary action in religion. Secondly, it seemed probable that the era of differentiation was coming to a close, and an era of absorption, consolidation and concentration opening. There had been a great growth of auxiliary organizations, with specialized functions; and many new forms of association had been evolved, such as federations of churches and other groupings. In the third respect, differentiating the concepts of the church, religious society, parish, and civil incorporation, he showed how the religious society, first, had been created by the civil power, and how, after the Revolution, great efforts were made to devise a good method whereby any religious body could receive incorporation. At the present time many laws recognize the organization and functionaries of churches, and give them authorization; while in some states there has been a tendency, likely to increase, toward the creation of corporations sole.

Professor Francis A. Christie of Meadville Theological Seminary, read an elaborate paper on the Date of the Ignatian Epistles. The date most often assigned to them has been about 110 A. D. The external (Eusebian) authority on which this date was grounded being regarded by the essayist as baseless, internal evidence must be relied on. He argued for a date during the reign of Hadrian. The chief heresy attacked in the epistles is the Doketic denial of the flesh of Christ and the consequent withdrawal from the Eucharist as celebrated by the parish bishop. The letters were demonstrably written before the Gnostic speculations were combated by means of the Logos doctrine, but at a time when Doketic

conceptions of Christ were becoming known in the churches of Syria and Asia Minor. Such views seem not to have been known in those regions until the appearance of Saturninus, Cerdon and Marcion, who cannot have been active before A. D. 130. Yet on the other hand the letters appear to have been written before Marcion's literary activity began.

The last paper, on the Origin of the Apostles' Creed, by Professor Arthur C. McGiffert of Union Theological Seminary, was in his absence read by Dr. Jackson. The writer found no earlier occurrence of the Apostles' Creed than in Gaul and Spain in the sixth century, but dealt with the origin of the old Roman Symbol from which it was derived, and which may be traced to the latter part of the second century. Some have thought that it was known in Rome when Marcion came, and to Justin, but Dr. McGiffert saw no evidence of its existence before Irenaeus, and dated it at about 150-175 A. D. Devised as a baptismal confession, and as necessary for protection against heresy, it bears evidence of its time in the nature of the errors, Doketic and Gnostic, against which its phrases are manifestly directed. Much of the paper was given to an analysis of these phrases, conducted from this point of view.

The evening session, as has already been mentioned, was given, after an address of welcome by Mayor Maybury of Detroit, to the inaugural address of Professor Richard T. Ely, President of the American Economic Association, and to a similar address by Dr. James Ford Rhodes, substituted for that which had been expected from Dr. Edward Eggleston as President of the American Historical Association. Dr. Ely chose as his subject "Competition, its Nature, Permanency and Beneficence." He dwelt on the development of competition through successive stages of economic life, pointing out how, originally cruel, it had constantly risen in plane during the progress of social evolution, so that slaughter, slavery, child-labor, and many unwholesome and oppressive practices once inseparable from competition had been successively ruled out. He dwelt also upon the thought that social evolution among men brought into being, along with competition, the growing enlargement of the associated competitive group; and the larger the competitive group, the greater the scope of sympathy, benevolence and public authority. Through the selective process of competition, a permanent element of human society, we have the survival of the fit; but it is for society to create such economic conditions that only desirable social qualities shall constitute eminent fitness for survival. The beneficence of the competitive order depends on the reconciliation of the effort to secure equality of opportunity to individuals and the maintenance

and development of those great economic institutions, such as private property and inheritance, which, though they limit competition, are justly regarded as among the principal achievements and possessions of our race.

Mr. Rhodes spoke upon the Writing of History. One should make sure of having, either in respect to manner or in respect to facts, something new to say. Historical originality may lie, to mention one particular, in the employment of some class of sources open to everyone but not heretofore used. A significant case of this in American history is the use which Dr. von Holst made of newspaper material. In the years just before the Civil War facts are to be found in the newspapers which were nowhere else set down. Dr. von Holst had appreciated this, had read them extensively, and used them with pertinence and effect, where previous writers had been prone to avoid them because of their inaccuracy and their mass. After touching upon the larger questions of style and of the mastery of facts, Mr. Rhodes discussed the subject of footnotes. Admitting that a mass of them was cumbrous and distracted the average reader from the narrative, he dwelt upon the profit which the historian derived from being held, or holding himself, to a strict responsibility for his statements through the necessity of supporting them by exact references. Their use was especially valuable in keeping the writer from hasty or strained or imperfect generalizations. Finally, the qualities of some of the great ancient and modern historians were passed in review, with several interesting suggestions as to methods of preparation and composition.

At Ann Arbor, on Friday morning, President Angell opened the joint session of the two associations with an address of welcome marked by his usual felicity. The first paper, by Professor Paul S. Reinsch of the University of Wisconsin, on French Experiments with Political Assimilation in the West Indies, is that which we are so fortunate as to be permitted to present in this number of the REVIEW. In Dr. Reinsch's absence it was read by his colleague, Professor Haskins. Professor H. Morse Stephens of Cornell University then spoke informally on the Turning Points in the History of British Administration in India. He first described the situation in the period between the virtual cession of Bengal and the arrival of Warren Hastings, during which the Company and the government of Great Britain alike refused to recognize responsibility for administration. Hastings resolved, as far as was possible, to put the Company into the position which had been occupied by the Emperor in respect to the administration of the

imperial provinces; and from 1772 to 1828 the general system was one which recognized the native practices and declined to interfere with them. The years from 1828 to 1857, from Lord William Bentinck to the Mutiny, were marked by a definite and conscious tendency, on the part of the paramount power, to introduce regulations conceived from the point of view of England, for instance by the abolition of suttee and thuggee, the introduction of the official use of the English language, and Lord Dalhousie's policy of annexation. The result was disaffection, shown at the time of the Mutiny. From 1858 to 1872 was a period of reconstruction, marked by great increase of efficiency. Native rights were more respected, and the integrity of the native states conserved. At the same time there was much administrative centralization. The period since Lord Mayo's rule, 1872-1900, has been marked by administrative decentralization and especially the completer organization of the eight great provinces. The main lesson of Indian history is the necessity of studying the subject populations as they actually are.

Dr. J. H. Hollander, the Treasurer of Porto Rico, who was to have discoursed upon the finances of the island, was unable to be present. Professor John H. Finley of Princeton, upon the basis of a recent and extensive walking-tour, described the general conditions of Porto Rico, and discussed the resulting financial difficulties which Dr. Hollander had encountered. He also discussed the code which the first commission had provided, and the better plans of the new commission. He believed that projects of administrative reform should begin with the municipalities, and that a form of general government more nearly approaching that of our territories might well be substituted for that which has lately been established.

In the discussion which followed, Professor Henry E. Bourne, of Western Reserve University, emphasized the local quality in our colonial problems. It was possible to study the Porto Rican problem with relation either to our institutions, or to the origin of the Porto Rico bill, or to the Philippine question; or to study the problems of each of our colonies with reference to local conditions and the experience of European nations. Professor Charles H. Hull of Cornell University set forth with great clearness the fiscal system of Porto Rico as it existed in the year 1897-1898, the effects which were necessarily involved in the transfer of sovereignty, those which actually resulted, and the plans made necessary for the future.

In the afternoon, at the session devoted to Western history, Professor Edward G. Bourne of Yale University read portions of that paper on the Legend of Marcus Whitman, which we had the

pleasure of printing in our January issue. He illustrated the vogue of the legend in an amusing way by showing that, in the recent voting for the Hall of Fame, Whitman received more votes than Senator Benton, Chief-Judge Chase or General Scott, and the same number as President Monroe. Then Mr. William I. Marshall of Chicago assailed the legend with much warmth, declaring that he had contended against it ever since 1888. He asserted that it first appeared in the *Pacific*, the organ of the California Congregationalists, in the issue for November 9, 1865, in an article by Rev. Mr. Spalding. He also made quotations from letters of Whitman and his wife, written during the year between the arrival of the Canadian immigrants and the beginning of his famous ride, and tending to show the motives for the latter. Mr. Marshall described his determined efforts to procure the elimination of the Whitman story from school text-books of history, even going so far as to read private letters received from the writers of such books. He was followed by Mr. Ripley Hitchcock of New York, who admitted that he had originally countenanced the story, but on examination was forced to give it up as Dr. Elliott Coues had also felt obliged to do. Mr. Hitchcock gave great credit to Mrs. Victor for her pioneer investigation, and concluded by pointing out some elements of the situation, in the Northwest and in American diplomacy, inconsistent with the legend.

The second of these papers in Western history was by Professor Samuel B. Harding of Indiana State University, and related to the Party Struggles in Missouri from 1861 to 1865. He described the contest of 1861 over the question of union or disunion, the varieties of party opinion then existing, the struggle of the unconditional-Union men against Governor Jackson, the actions of the convention, and the course of Captain Lyon, which, however effective in a military sense, he declared to have been politically a mistake. From the death of Lyon and the establishment of martial law, the opposition to secession passed into the hands of the military. The writer then turned to the other contest, that respecting slavery, and traced it from Gratz Brown's speech of 1858, but especially from 1861, through the period of radical supremacy made evident in the convention of 1863, and so to the convention of 1865 which abolished slavery. A new period then began, because of the disfranchising clause and the disabilities inherited from the Civil War. The narrative was continued to the election of Gratz Brown in 1870 and the end of the sway of the radicals.

Professor Frank H. Hodder of the University of Kansas then read a paper on An Omitted Chapter in the History of the Second

Missouri Compromise. The resolution of March 2, 1821, for the admission of Missouri, provides "that the fourth clause of the twenty-sixth section of the third article of the constitution" of Missouri shall never be so construed as to permit the passing of an act depriving citizens of other states of any of their privileges under the Federal Constitution. Now the clause against which the opponents of slavery were contending, and against which this phrase of the resolution has been assumed to have been directed, is not the one thus numerically designated. Art. III., Sec. 26, consists of three unnumbered portions, the first prohibitory upon the legislature, and consisting of two clauses, the second permissive, in four clauses, the third mandatory, in two clauses. It is the first clause of this third portion that enjoins the general assembly to pass a law to prevent the immigration of free negroes. Eustis's resolution provided that "the clause forbidding free negroes" to enter the state should be withdrawn. The misleading designation first appears in a resolution offered in the House by S. Moore of Pennsylvania on February 2. Mr. Hodder traced its history through the contest over Clay's and Roberts's resolutions and Clay's joint committee to the final vote, in which the existing form was carried by a change of votes on the part of More and two other Pennsylvanian members and one from North Carolina. He expressed suspicions of deliberate misdescription, and made some effort to trace it to its source. The session was closed by remarks by Professor Macy of Iowa College, on the relations of Western history to general history, and on the points of comparison between westward migration in the Old World and that from the Old World to the New and to the West.

The last of the sessions devoted to papers, that of Saturday morning, was marked by one informal address in English history and one in the most recent period of American history, with ensuing discussion. Illness detained the other speakers. Professor Wilbur C. Abbott of Dartmouth described the results of an investigation into the history of the opposition in Parliament during the time of the American War, and especially in the Parliament of 1774-1780. At first the opposition usually numbered only forty or fifty. By the beginning of 1776 it had increased to eighty or ninety. While the surrender of Burgoyne had no effect upon it, the news of the French alliance immediately added forty or fifty members. Speaking generally, it was not till this time that the country gentlemen began to go over. From this point the opposition steadily increased till Dunning's motion was carried. Dr. Abbott described the nature of the ministerial party and its resulting liability to sudden collapse, the influence of army officers discredited by the government be-

cause of defeat, the small effects of the accession of Fox. He concluded that the American War had less influence on Parliament than was commonly supposed ; and that enlistments were not so difficult, nor the war so generally unpopular, as has been thought.

Professor Dunning of Columbia University then spoke on the Undoing of Reconstruction. Contrasting the abundant possession of political power by the negroes in 1870, when reconstruction was complete, with their present exclusion from the exercise of political rights, he characterized the three chief periods of the process through which this has come about. The first period, which had already begun during the years of reconstruction, and was complete by 1877, was marked by the ejection of the blacks from the governments of the Southern states especially through the "Mississippi plan" of systematic intimidation. The second, 1877-1890, during which the balance of national political parties made partisan Federal legislation impossible, while the judiciary rejected the Civil Rights Acts, was the period of fraud as distinguished from force. The last decade had been marked by open assertion of the necessity of repression and of white rule, and by systematic endeavors, through constitutional revision, to legalize what had before been done illegally. Professor Dunning dwelt on the thoughts, that the problem of the co-existence of the two races in the United States could not be settled by the mere abolition of slavery ; and that the undoing of reconstruction had shown that it could not be settled on the basis of equality.

In the discussion which ensued, Professor Hart of Harvard, alluding to the various aspects under which the subject might be discussed, confined himself to the question how far success had been attained in the great endeavor to abolish the distinction of color in legal relations. He touched upon the abolition of slavery, the extent to which there was equality before the courts, the exclusion from the franchise, and the failure to secure social equality. Mr. Percy N. Booth of Louisville spoke of the drift of the Southern negroes into the black states, from the highlands into the lowlands, and away from the villages,—the apparent tendency toward isolation of the races. Dr. Theodore Clarke Smith discussed the question, what the Republican leaders of the reconstruction movement expected. He showed that most were uncertain ; that Stevens's aim was to secure party supremacy and the results of the war ; that Sumner, Wilson and Greeley, filled with the spirit of the liberalism of their generation, had no doubts. The negro was a man, therefore give him a vote. He was a man, therefore he would use it well. Stevens and many others thought that there would be

enough Southern white Republicans to control him. Others, with some doubting, thought that he would soon learn. Others expected that his vote would always be so valuable to either side that he would be courted by both. Others thought that he would maintain his newly conferred rights only so long as supported by force. All predictions proved wrong except these last. The reasons why the Republicans had acquiesced in the recent situation were, first, that they had concluded that the dangers apprehended by Stevens were imaginary ; secondly, because of the decay of the old-fashioned liberalism, of the belief in equal rights and abstract rights generally, and the substitution of an evolutionary philanthropy for that based on the earlier doctrines.

With this ended the sessions devoted to papers. If any general criticism were to be ventured, it would be that too many of the writers ignored that wholesome rule of the Association, printed conspicuously upon the programme, which limited papers to twenty minutes, and discussions to ten minutes for each speaker. Deliberately to prepare and read a paper forty minutes long is an act without excuse ; nor can much be said in defense of "brief remarks" extending to fifteen or twenty minutes. The kindly gentlemen who presided, not being presidents, were evidently reluctant, clothed in a little brief authority, to apply the *clôture* ; but many hearers would fain have seen them truculent and remorseless. Another evil, deserving correction in future meetings, is the substitution, for fresh and real discussion of the longer papers, of cut-and-dried short papers. The "liberty of prophesying" which prevailed in the earlier meetings of the Association had its evils ; but a Rhadamanthine president can avert them.

At noon the two associations partook together of a subscription luncheon at the Russell House. President Angell, to everyone's enjoyment, acted as toastmaster, and talked entertainingly of the growth of the historical and economic professions since the time when he was at college. Mr. Henry Russel, attorney of the Michigan Central Railroad, read in honor of Hon. Peter White a humorous dialect poem entitled "Pierre Le Blanc." Professor Ely, Mr. Reuben G. Thwaites of Madison, Professor W. Z. Ripley of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Professor Hart also spoke.

The business session, on Saturday afternoon, was unusually well attended, and there was evidence of warm interest in the many important tasks which the Association has entrusted, or proposed to entrust, to its committees. It was reported that there were 1,626 members of the Association, representing a gain of 215 over last

year. The next meeting had, by previous arrangement, been appointed to be held at Washington. The Council reported in favor of meeting in April 1902; but the Association preferred to meet as usual at Christmas-time. It was left to the Committee on the Programme to fix the date more exactly, in conference with the American Economic Association. It can now be announced, with a fair degree of assurance, that the sessions will be held on Saturday, December 28, Monday, December 30 and Tuesday, December 31. The constitution was so amended as to provide for the existence of both a secretary and a corresponding secretary. The Council announced the appointment of Professor Charles H. Haskins of the University of Wisconsin as chairman of the Committee on Programme, and of General A. W. Greeley, U. S. A., of Washington, as chairman of the Local Committee of Arrangements, for the seventeenth annual meeting; and each was given authority to complete his committee at his discretion. It also announced the re-election of Professor George B. Adams of Yale University as a member of the Board of Editors of the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, for the term expiring January 1, 1907.

The death of the First Vice-President and the resignation of the Secretary gave especial significance to the election of officers at this meeting. The Second Vice-President, Mr. Charles Francis Adams of Massachusetts, was elected President of the Association; Professor Herbert B. Adams of Baltimore, the retiring secretary, First Vice-President; Captain Alfred T. Mahan, U. S. N., Second Vice-President. Mr. A. Howard Clark, hitherto assistant secretary, was elected Secretary; Professor Haskins Corresponding Secretary. Chief Justice Fuller and Professor Hart retiring from the Council, Professors A. Lawrence Lowell of Harvard and J. Franklin Jameson of Brown University were elected in their places. A full list of the officers of the Association and of the members of its committees, so far as determined at the time of going to press, is given on a later page, at the end of the present article. A minute expressing the Society's appreciation of the long and effective services of Professor Herbert B. Adams as Secretary was adopted by a rising vote. Professor Theodor Mommsen of Berlin was elected an honorary member. It was agreed that delegates should be elected to the International Historical Congress to be held at Rome in 1902. Resolutions expressing the sorrow of the members at the loss of Professor Moses Coit Tyler were adopted by a standing vote. The project of a "Monographic History of America," to be issued under the auspices of the Society, was discussed at some length. It was finally referred back to the Council for further con-

sideration and for discussion at the next annual meeting. For reference in view of this discussion, we subjoin to this article a statement prepared by Professor Hart and sent out by the Council shortly before the Detroit meeting.

The Treasurer, Dr. Clarence W. Bowen, made one of those highly gratifying reports for which he is now looked to annually with perfect confidence. Though the expenditures of the year had been substantially \$5335, he showed assets of \$13,405, an increase of \$824 since last year. Mr. Thwaites reported for the Historical Manuscripts Commission. Professor Charles M. Andrews of Bryn Mawr, chairman of the committee on the Justin Winsor Prize, reported that it was awarded to Mr. W. A. Shaper of Dubuque, hereafter to be a member of the faculty of the University of Minnesota, for an essay on "Sectionalism and Representation in South Carolina." He also reported a code of rules for the award of the prize in future years. They were adopted by the meeting, and are printed on a later page, at the end of the present article. Reports were also made by Professor George B. Adams, for the editorial board of the REVIEW, by Professor Edward G. Bourne, chairman of the Committee on Publications, and by Professor William Mac-Donald of Bowdoin College, chairman of the Public Archives Commission. Resolutions were adopted expressing thanks for the hospitality of those who have been mentioned above as entertaining the Association, and to the two committees who had assured the success of the meeting; and the Association adjourned.

#### PROJECT OF A CO-OPERATIVE HISTORY.

The Committee appointed at Boston to consider a co-operative history of the United States has reported to the Council in favor of the project, and will ask the Council at the Detroit meeting to pass the following proposed vote:

*Voted*, That a standing committee of five be appointed to arrange for the publication of a co-operative history of the United States, under the auspices of the Association, on the following conditions:

1. The Committee to have power to decide on the scope and extent of the work; the publication to be made in small volumes, each complete in itself so far as it goes.
2. The Committee to have power to choose an editor-in-chief, to carry on the work, subject to the determinations of the Committee, which will represent the Association.
3. The Committee to have power to make publishing arrangements.
4. The Association in no case to have any pecuniary responsibility or liability for any expense connected with the history.

5. The Committee to report annually to the Association until the work is finished.

Experienced publishers believe that a work prepared on this plan, under the supervision of the Association, would easily pay for itself. Inasmuch as the plan is a new one, the chairman of the special committee (Professor Albert Bushnell Hart, Cambridge, Massachusetts) will be glad to have the opinions of members of the Association by letter before the Detroit meeting.

#### THE JUSTIN WINSOR PRIZE.

The Justin Winsor prize of \$100, offered by the American Historical Association for the encouragement of historical research, will be awarded for the year 1901 to the best unpublished monograph in the field of American History which shall be submitted to the Committee of Award on or before October 1, 1901.

I. The prize is intended for writers who have not yet published any considerable work or obtained an established reputation.

II. The monograph must be based upon independent and original investigation in American history, by which is meant the history of any of the British colonies in America to 1776, of other portions of the continent which have since been included in the territory of the United States, and of the United States. It may deal with any aspect of that history—social, political, constitutional, religious, economic, military, or biographical, though in the last two instances a treatment exclusively military or biographical would be unfavorably received.

III. The subject matter of the monograph must be of more than personal or local interest and in its conclusions and results must be a distinct contribution to knowledge. In its statements it must attain a high degree of accuracy and in its treatment of the facts collected it must show on the part of the writer powers of original and suggestive interpretation.

IV. The work must conform to the accepted canons of historical research and criticism. It must be presented in what is commonly understood as a scientific manner, and must contain the necessary apparatus of critical bibliography (a mere list of titles will not be deemed sufficient), references to all authorities, and footnotes. In length the work should not be less than 30,000 words or about 100 pages of print. It may be more. If not typewritten, the work must be written legibly upon only one side of the sheet, and must be in form ready for publication. In making the award, the Committee will take into consideration, not only research, accuracy, and originality, but also clearness of expression, logical arrangement, and literary form. The prize will not be awarded unless the work submitted shall be of a high degree of excellence. The successful monograph will be published by the American Historical Association. Address all correspondence to the Chairman of the Committee, Professor Charles M. Andrews, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL  
ASSOCIATION.

<i>President,</i>	Charles Francis Adams, Esq.
<i>First Vice-President,</i>	Professor Herbert B. Adams.
<i>Second Vice-President,</i>	Captain Alfred T. Mahan, U. S. N.
<i>Secretary,</i>	A. Howard Clark, Esq.
<i>Corresponding Secretary,</i>	Professor Charles H. Haskins.
<i>Treasurer,</i>	Clarence W. Bowen, Esq.
<i>Secretary of the Church History Section,</i>	Rev. Dr. Samuel M. Jackson.
<i>Executive Council</i> (in addition to the above named officers):	
	Hon. Andrew D. White, <sup>1</sup>
	President Charles Kendall Adams, <sup>1</sup>
	President James B. Angell, <sup>1</sup>
	Henry Adams, Esq., <sup>1</sup>
	Hon. George F. Hoar, <sup>1</sup>
	James Schouler, Esq., <sup>1</sup>
	Professor George P. Fisher, <sup>1</sup>
	James Ford Rhodes, Esq., <sup>1</sup>
	Edward Eggleston, Esq., <sup>1</sup>
	Professor George B. Adams, <sup>2</sup>
	Professor Andrew C. McLaughlin, <sup>2</sup>
	Professor William A. Dunning, <sup>2</sup>
	Hon. Peter White, <sup>2</sup>
	Professor J. Franklin Jameson, <sup>2</sup>
	Professor A. Lawrence Lowell. <sup>2</sup>

*Committees:*

*Committee on the Programme of the Next Meeting:* Professor Charles H. Haskins, chairman, Professor George B. Adams, Dr. Samuel M. Jackson, Professor William MacDonald, President Lyon G. Tyler, and Professor J. M. Vincent.

*Local Committee of Arrangements:* General A. W. Greeley (with authority to complete the committee).

*Historical Manuscripts Commission:* Professor Edward G. Bourne, chairman, Reuben G. Thwaites, Esq., Professor F. W. Moore, Professor Max Farrand, Dr. T. C. Smith.

*Committee on the Justin Winsor Prize:* Professor C. M. Andrews, chairman, Professor E. P. Cheyney, Miss Elizabeth Kendall, Roger Foster, Esq., Professor E. E. Sparks.

<sup>1</sup> Ex-presidents.

<sup>2</sup> Elected members.

*Committee on Bibliography*: A. Howard Clark, Esq., chairman,  
Messrs. W. E. Foster, J. N. Larned, George Iles, W. C.  
Lane, A. P. C. Griffin and E. C. Richardson.

*Committee on Publications*: [Professor E. G. Bourne, chairman,]  
A. Howard Clark, Esq., Professor F. M. Fling, Rev. Dr. S.  
M. Jackson, Professor A. D. Morse, Miss Sarah M. Dean,  
E. F. Henderson, Esq., and Professor Charles Gross.

*Public Archives Commission*: Professor William MacDonald,  
chairman, Professors L. G. Bugbee and H. W. Caldwell.

*General Committee*: The Corresponding Secretary, chairman,  
Miss Lucy M. Salmon, Professors G. E. Howard, William  
MacDonald and J. H. Robinson.

## THE YEAR 1000 AND THE ANTECEDENTS OF THE CRUSADES<sup>1</sup>

THE passion of the nineteenth century has been the study of origins. Our historians of the Crusades, seeking a starting-point, have been prone to find one (though not the only one) in a panic of terror said to have fallen upon Christendom as it neared the close of the first thousand years of its existence—a belief that the world would end with the year 1000.

Thus Michaud, at the opening of the century; thus Archer, at its closing. Even Heinrich von Sybel, whose epoch-making history of the First Crusade opened a new era of critical study in this field, and who, in the revised edition published in 1881, could with just pride congratulate himself that in the forty years since its first appearance its main conclusions had been adopted by all leading scholars, and could hope that "perhaps in another forty years they will have the fortune to find a place in the manuals and the textbooks," tells us still in this new edition that

"As the first thousand years of our calendar drew to an end, in every land of Europe the people expected with certainty the destruction of the world. Some squandered their substance in riotous living, others bestowed it for the salvation of their souls on churches and convents, bewailing multitudes lay by day and by night about the altars, many looked with terror, yet most with a secret hope, for the conflagration of the earth and the falling of the heavens."<sup>2</sup>

Alas for human fallibility! The legend which he thus re-echoes had within the decade been already twice refuted, and with a conclusiveness more crushing than his own exposure of the legends of the First Crusade. In the score of years that since has passed Peter the Hermit and Godfrey of Bouillon have even in manual and text-book begun to take the background. Is it not time, now that three further critics have sifted, and with the same result, the legend of the year 1000, that it should vanish from our thought of the Crusades? And could we find a better moment for its study

<sup>1</sup> Read, at the late annual meeting of the American Historical Association, as the opening paper of a session devoted to the Crusades and the East.

<sup>2</sup> H. v. Sybel, *Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzugs* (2te, neu bearbeitete Auflage, Leipzig, 1881), p. 150.

than now, as we stand at the threshold of another Christian century and look across it to the near close of another millennium?

The earliest author, and the only pre-modern one, in whose pages has been found any mention of a panic at the year 1000 is the German abbot Joannes Tritemius, who lived and wrote just as the fifteenth century was changing to the sixteenth. In his chronicle of the world, the *Annales Hirsaugienses*, as it now lies before us, there is, in the passage devoted to the year 1000, this sentence: "In this year a terrible comet appeared, which by its look terrified many, who feared that the last day was at hand; inasmuch as several years before it had been predicted by some, deluded by a false calculation, that the visible world would end in the year of Christ 1000." But, as this chronicle, left in manuscript by its author, was never printed in full till 1690, as the abridged form earlier printed says nothing of this panic, even mentioning the comet in another connection, and as by 1690 the belief in such a panic was already in vogue from other sources, there is much reason to suspect that the sentence belongs not to Tritemius but to his seventeenth-century editors. Whether his or not, it should perhaps be brought into connection with an earlier passage, under the year 960, which tells of the appearance at the council of princes in Worms of a Thuringian hermit, named Bernhard, well versed in the scriptures and popularly venerated as a saint, who declared it revealed to him that the end of the world was already at hand. Some, says Tritemius, thought him an inspired prophet, while others laughed at him as a man out of his mind or swollen by self-conceit.

But the first book to publish to the world the millennial terror was the famous *Annales Ecclesiastici* of Cardinal Baronius, in 1605. Beginning with the year 1001 the eleventh volume of his great work, he opens it with the statement that this year, the first of a new century, had been by some "foretold as the world's last, or nigh thereto, when Antichrist should be revealed;" and he quotes in full from the tenth-century abbot, Abbo of Fleury, a passage telling how while he was yet a youth he heard in Paris a preacher declare that at the end of the thousandth year Antichrist should come and not long after him the Judgment,<sup>1</sup> and how once in Lorraine there had spread a report that when Annunciation Day should fall on Good Friday the end of the world would arrive. To this, from Sigebert of Gembloux he adds a list of the prodigies seen in the year 1000, remarking that these might well seem heralds of

<sup>1</sup> "De fine quoque mundi coram populo sermonem in Ecclesia Parisiorum adolescentulus audivi, quod statim, finito mille annorum numero, Antichristus adveniret, et non longo post tempore, universale judicium succederet."

such a catastrophe, then quotes from Gerbert a rhetorical allusion to the impending days of Antichrist and from Thietmar and Radulf Glaber such testimony to the corruption of the times as could well make it believable.

For what is found in a work of such authority one does not too closely scan the proofs. Thus set afloat, the story was sure to spread; and like all good stories, it grew. In 1633 Le Vasseur, in his annals of the church of Noyon, enriched it with the statement, which he thought he drew from Radulf Glaber—the familiar passage about the earth's "covering herself with a white robe of churches"—that the world's escape from the terrors of the year 1000 was the occasion of a great burst of church-building. Thus enriched, it passed into the great Benedictine works of the eighteenth century—the annals of Mabillon, the dictionary of Calmet, the *Histoire Littéraire de la France*—and into many another standard work of learning. If here and there a scholar like Fleury, Muratori, Voltaire, Gibbon, gave it no mention, the silence passed unnoticed.

But it was the Scotchman Robertson who made it a commonplace of history. In that luminous *View of the Progress of Society in Europe during the Middle Ages* which in 1769 he prefaced to his *History of Charles the Fifth*, and which, translated into all European tongues, remained for a century the favorite survey of medieval civilization, he not only emphasized the panic, bringing it into direct connection with the Crusades, but gave it a more scientific standing by citing in its support, besides Abbo, three medieval chronicles—those of St. Pantaleon and Godellus and the "Annalista Saxo." It remained only, in our own century, for that inspired Frenchman, Jules Michelet, to reveal its worth to literature at large. It is the keynote of that majestic prose dirge upon the misery of France under the early Capetians with which, in 1833, he began this period of his great history. And he lends it vividness by working into his narrative, after his fashion, not only from the chronicles, but from the Councils and from the preambles of charters,<sup>1</sup> what seem corroborative extracts.

Poet, novelist, dramatist, have since made the most of it.<sup>2</sup> Even the German historian-poet, Felix Dahn, was beguiled into devoting to it a cycle of lyrics; and the Italian poet-historian Carducci has depicted it in a prose poem more melodious than verse.

Yet protesting voices began to be raised. In 1840 the Italian jurist Francesco Forti doubted that the panic could have been gen-

<sup>1</sup> These, indeed, Michaud, the historian of the Crusades, had used before him.

<sup>2</sup> A long list, though by no means an exhaustive one, is given by Orsi, in his monograph later to be mentioned.

eral. In 1861 the French archaeologist Auber denied and disproved its effect upon architecture. In 1867 Olleris, the editor of the works of Gerbert, felt forced to exclaim: "One does not see that this fatal date then inspired in anybody the terror which was later singularly exaggerated by ignorant monks."

But it was not till 1873 that a scholar took the legend seriously in hand. Then, at last, in the *Revue des Questions Historiques* the Benedictine François Plaine put it to a sifting so thorough that his might well have been the last word.<sup>1</sup> Dealing first with the monkish historians of the later Middle Ages, he showed that the story was no exaggeration of theirs, since not one of them mentions it at all. Then, taking up one by one the contemporary annalists of the early eleventh century, Italian, German, French, English, he pointed out their utter silence as to such a panic, nay more, how much in them seems incompatible with such a thing. Next he discussed the true meaning of that handful of passages which to Baronius, to Robertson, to Michelet, had seemed to imply such a terror. True it is that the Council of Trosly reminded the bishops that "soon we shall behold the majestic and terrible day when every shepherd with his flock shall appear before the supreme Shepherd." But the Council of Trosly was in the year 909, its words specify no date for the end of things, and they were only such words as had been constantly heard since the birth of Christianity. The abbot Adson, it is true, wrote, about the year 954, a booklet on the Antichrist. But it was only a book of exegesis, meant to enlighten Queen Gerberga on an obscure point of the faith, and it nowhere intimates that the author himself or anybody else thought Antichrist at hand. It is true that Abbo of Fleury tells of a preacher at Paris who looked for the end of the world in the year 1000; but he tells us also that he himself refuted him from Scripture on the spot, and, though it is clear from the allusion to his youth that this could hardly have been later than the year 960, while Abbo wrote his narrative in 998, he nowhere intimates that the delusion was ever heard of again. True, he represents the people of Lorraine as later (it must have been about 975) terrified at the prospect of Annunciation's falling on Good Friday; but this conjunction was due in the year 992, and he not only tells us that the delusion was refuted (which was the easier because the two days had already fallen together more than once) but that it was dispelled.<sup>2</sup> Nor can it be denied that the monk William Godel, writing a

<sup>1</sup> *Revue des Questions Historiques*, XXIII. 145-164. Paris, 1873.

<sup>2</sup> His *Apologeticus*, in which these passages occur, is addressed to the King of France, and in it he is demonstrating his own orthodoxy by recounting the errors which during his lifetime he has known and fought.

couple of centuries later, does, as Robertson says, assert that in the year 1010 people in many places thought in their fright that the end of the world was at hand ; but the *whole* of what he says is that “*at the news of the taking of Jerusalem by the Turks* people in their fright thought the end of the world at hand”—a phrase which will hardly be taken too seriously. And, after all, the year 1010 was not the year 1000.<sup>1</sup>

And Radulf Glaber—*Anglice* Ralph the Bald—on whom, above all, the tradition has been made to rest ? If anybody could know of a panic at the year 1000, it would surely be Radulf Glaber—a superstitious and garrulous old monk, who, in a day when monasteries were the only inns, and when his Burgundian home, on the border of three realms, was the highway for that army of pilgrims pressing ever to Cluny and to Rome, spent his life at this, that, and the other abbey, with ears wide open for every tale of prodigy, and widest for those of direful import. He believed, too, in the mystic worth of numbers, and the year 1000 was precisely the theme of his chronicle : he would relate, he said, the uncommon multitude of edifying things which had come to pass in the vicinage of the thousandth year of Christ's incarnation. Yet, alas, though his pages are alive with signs and wonders in Heaven and in Earth, and though not a few of these belong to the year 1000 itself, not even Radulf knows of any fear that then the world would end. The only passage savoring of such a thought, is his portrayal of that terrible famine which fell “as there drew on the thousand and thirty-third year of the incarnate Christ, which is from the *passion* of the said Saviour the thousandth.”

There remain the preambles of the charters ; but it was easy for Dom Plaine to point out that such preambles were but copied bodily out of a formula-book, and that the particular one cited in evidence—*appropinquante mundi termino*—belongs to the old collection of Marculf and has been demonstrably in use since the seventh century ; easy, too, to demonstrate that the formula continued in use after the year 1000, as before.

Turning then from the ruined legend, the Benedictine showed what a busy and aggressive time for Christendom was that year of alleged despair—when the wisest man of his day, Gerbert, was Pope, and the most enthusiastic, young Otto, was Emperor—when Hungary and Bohemia and the Scandinavian North were simultaneously turning to the Christian faith, and the Spaniards with renewed vigor were forcing back their Moslem neighbors. And nowhere in

<sup>1</sup> As for the chronicle of St. Pantaleon and the Saxon annalist, cited by Robertson, the terror mentioned by them occurred a century later, at the time of the First Crusade.

all this, or in what we are told in the lesser activities of church and society, the slightest mention of such a motive as the impending end of the world.

In fine, then, the sole contemporary evidence for a panic of terror at the year 1000 proved to be a statement that forty years earlier one Paris preacher named it as the date of the end of the world—a preacher whose prophecy was at once refuted, and, for aught we can learn, at once forgotten,

The refutation was crushing. Yet one convinced against his will might in this essay by an ecclesiastic for a conservative review suspect a partisan loyalty to the Middle Ages. And it must be confessed that its tone is a trifle polemic. But no suspicion of conservatism could lie against the next assailant. It was the anti-clerical Raoul Rosières, who five years later, in 1878, when about to bring out the two works<sup>1</sup> by which he hoped to help "declericalize" and "deroyalize" France, found it necessary to test this legend before using it. His study he published in the *Revue Politique*.<sup>2</sup> His analysis of the question, though slightly briefer, was not less effective. His results were the same. As he clearly knew nothing of the earlier paper of Dom Plaine and stood for so opposite a point of approach, the agreement of their conclusions was the more convincing.

French scholarship needed no further enlightenment; but the Germans, witness Von Sybel, were not yet all abreast. It was in 1883 that Heinrich von Eicken, doubtless already gathering material for what is still our best book on the medieval point of view,<sup>3</sup> brought the matter of the year 1000, by an article in a German historical review, to the notice of German scholars.<sup>4</sup> Though he had seen Rosières's paper, he knows nothing of that of Dom Plaine; and even, he tells us, before knowing of Rosières's, his own studies had lately convinced him of the baselessness of the tradition. It is especially from German sources that he now confirms and expands the work of the Frenchman.

The latest word in defence of the legend which I remember to have heard from any competent scholar was from Léon Gautier, lecturing to his class in the École des Chartes at Paris, in the win-

<sup>1</sup> His *Recherches sur l'Histoire Religieuse de la France* (Paris, 1879), and his *Histoire de la Société Française au Moyen-Age, 987-1483* (Paris, 1880).

<sup>2</sup> *Revue Politique et Littéraire*, 2d series, XIV. 919-924 (Paris, 1878). His article is entitled: *Études Nouvelles sur l'Ancienne France: La Légende de l'An Mil.*

<sup>3</sup> His *Geschichte und System der mittelalterlichen Weltanschauung*.

<sup>4</sup> *Forschungen zur Deutschen Geschichte*, XXIII. 303-318 (Göttingen, 1883). His article calls itself: *Die Legende von der Erwartung des Weltunterganges und aer Wiederkehr Christi im Jahre 1000.*

ter of 1885. He admitted the refutation of the narrative evidence, but still thought that in the charters the formula about the end of the world grew more frequent as the year 1000 approached. But even while he spoke his younger colleague, M. Jules Roy, was preparing, for the popular *Bibliothèque des Merveilles*, a little monograph which should not only dispel such lingering doubts, but reach the ear of a wider public.<sup>1</sup> This interesting little volume, after dealing with the whole history of the fear of the end of the world and refuting the legend of the year 1000, portrays from the sources the real condition of the world and especially of France in the last half of the tenth century and the first of the eleventh.

At almost the same time a young Italian scholar who has since won eminence as an historian—Pietro Orsi—was making the year 1000 and its legend the subject of a thesis at the University of Turin. First presented in 1884, it was able, before its publication in 1887 in the *Rivista Storica Italiana*, to take cognizance of Roy's book, and is for scholars the most methodical and exhaustive exposition of its theme.<sup>2</sup> But, though more complete, its results tally with those of Plaine and Rosières and Eicken and Roy; and at the end its author can but echo their conclusion: "The terrors of the year 1000 are only a legend and a myth." Nor has any scholar, since the first assault, a quarter-century ago, cared to print a word in protest.

But, I hear you exclaim, you who have felt how awesome, even in these rational days, is the ending of a century, how could there help being terror, in that age, at the close of a millennium? It was, I am convinced, precisely this sense of intrinsic probability which made it so easy for scholars else cautious and thorough to fall into the error; and it may be worth a moment to ask why such a panic was not then so natural as at first appears.

First of all, and most important, the belief in the end of the world was already worn out. It had cried "Wolf" too often. It began with the very first generation of Christians, and sought a warrant in the words of the Christ himself. Almost the oldest Christian book we have—the second letter of Paul to the Thessalonians—is a protest against it. But it lived on. It found an echo in the Apocalypse and in the letters ascribed to Peter and to Jude. It sounded on through the Fathers, from Tertullian to Gregory the

<sup>1</sup> *L'An Mille: Formation de la Légende de l'An Mille, —État de la France de l'an 950 à l'an 1050* (Paris, 1885), 351 pp. There is at the end an excellent bibliography.

<sup>2</sup> *L'Anno Mille: Saggio di Critica Storica* (Torino, 1887), 62 pp., reprinted from the *Rivista Storica Italiana*, Vol. IV. (1887). In 1891 Professor Orsi threw it into briefer popular form for a lecture, at Venice, on *Le Paure del Finimondo nell' Anno 1000*. This was also published (Turin, 1891, 31 pp.).

Great. Augustine, like Paul, had to make a stand against it. The end was always coming, and never came. But precisely for this reason it grew at length a mark of orthodoxy to deny that the time of the end could be foreknown, and on the lips of all pious churchmen, as on those of Adson and Abbo in the tenth century, were the words "Of that day and hour knoweth no man," "The day of the Lord cometh as a thief in the night." Even the credulous millenarian, whose own millennium was of course no thousand years of this world, but the thousand of Christ's reign which should follow it, yet who had built on the prophecies of Old Testament and New, and especially on the text that "with God a thousand years are as one day," a belief that his millennial Sabbath would set in at the end of the sixth thousand years from the Creation (and even Augustine believed that this was in his day nearly up), must have felt his faith wax faint as date after date inferred from Ezekiel and from Daniel passed by and brought no change. Bishop Gregory of Tours in the sixth century wrote his chronicle of the times already past *propter eos qui adpropinquantem mundi finem desperant*—"for the sake of those who despair of the end of the world." In the tenth century, then, it was only ignorant laymen like those of Lorraine, or some ill-trained visionary like Abbo's preacher, who could put faith in a date for the end of the world. And Dom Plaine may well be right in believing that it was only the revival of millenary dreams in the century following the Reformation which made it easy for Baronius and his contemporaries to fancy a panic at the year 1000.

It must be remembered, further, that the round numbers of a decimal system had much less vogue in the tenth century than now. It was the I, V, X, L, C, D, M, of the old Roman notation which governed the numerical ideas of men. Nor was currency, or weight, or measure, in the scales of that day a decimal matter. Under the influence of the Hebrew Scriptures even the decimals of classical antiquity had largely given place to the sacred round numbers of the Jews—the threes, the sevens, the twelves, and their multiples; and especially was this the case in all that pertained to prophecy.

Nor may one forget that the Christian calendar itself was yet a novel thing in the year 1000. The monk Dionysius, who at the middle of the sixth century devised it, had no authority to impose its adoption; and it crept but slowly into use. Monkish chronicles had early begun to employ it; but the first pope to date by the Christian era his official letters was John XIII., scarce thirty years before the year 1000; and "its use," says the latest and highest authority, Arthur Giry, "did not become general in the west of

Europe till after the year 1000"—wherefore the name of *millésime*, by which the French still call a Christian date. In Spain, indeed, it was not used until the fourteenth century; and by Greek Christians not until the fifteenth.

Even when it had come in, it was reinforced in all formal papers by other datings—by the regnal years of pope or emperor or king, by the year of the induction, perhaps by others. Nor was it yet or for long agreed just how to reckon by the Christian calendar. Some preferred to count their years from the Lord's Passion, instead of his Incarnation. And if from the Incarnation, should that be dated from the Nativity, at December 25, or from the Conception, three-quarters of a year earlier? Dionysius himself would seem to have preferred the latter; and even to this day we cannot be sure whether he meant to place the birth of Christ at the beginning or at the end of the first year of our Christian calendar—in the year 753 or the year 754 of the Roman city. Throughout the Middle Ages there prevailed the widest variance as to when the New Year should set in—here it was begun at Christmas, there at Annunciation, yonder at Easter, in Venice on the first of March, in Russia at the vernal equinox, in the Greek Empire on the first of September, in Spain on the first of January. Florence and Pisa, agreeing in the use of that Mary-year which was still in vogue among our great-grandfathers in England and America as late as 1752, could yet not agree which twenty-fifth of March one ought to count from; and, neighbor-towns though they were, Pisa began her year just twelve months ahead of Florence. What havoc must this work with the punctuality of the end of the world!

And if through such confusion men's sense of date grew blunt, how much more through the needlessness to most people of dates at all—that is, of Christian-era dates. To us who at every turn are stared at by calendars and date-lines, who must every day of our lives again and again write day and month and year, it is not easy to realize a world wherein all this is the affair of priests and notaries. The ordinary man, gentle and simple, of the year 1000, could not have read a date if he had seen it. And, just as the hours of the day were to him not figures on a dial but those reminders which at prime and terce and sext and none and evensong called to him through the sweet bells of parish-church or minster, so his landmarks of the year were the great days of the Church, her feasts, her vigils, and her fasts—Easter and Ascension and Whitsunday, Michaelmas and Christmas and Ash-Wednesday—underscored and red-lettered for him by the solemn pageantry of worship. If Annunciation and Good Friday fell together, that was startling; but what recked he of years of the Incarnation?

Is it so strange, then, that the panic of the year 1000 is only a nightmare of modern scholars?

But there is another myth of the year 1000 whose relation to the Crusades is more patent. Among the letters of Gerbert, who in that year sat upon the papal throne as Silvester II., there has come down to us a curious document. It bears no date of year or place, and only its presence there suggests its authorship. "She who is Jerusalem"—for so the document begins—appeals to the universal church for aid. At first glance its fervid phrases seem a call to arms against her pagan spoilers, and in it scholars long saw the earliest suggestion of the Crusades. It was imputed to the pope among whose papers it was found, and some believed that it was the terrors of the year 1000 which had called it forth. It has, however, nothing in common with a papal utterance, and those who were content to count it Gerbert's were by no means agreed to count it his as Pope. In 1877 that arch-skeptic Julius Harttung (later Pflugk-Harttung) denied it to him altogether, advancing much cogent argument to prove it an effusion of a century later which had somehow strayed into Gerbert's papers.<sup>1</sup> In 1881 his view received the weighty adhesion of Count Paul Riant, who strengthened it by further argument.<sup>2</sup> Their verdict met acceptance at the hands of other scholars, including the authoritative editors of the Papal *Regesta*,<sup>3</sup> though Heinrich von Sybel refused to be convinced. But in 1889 that prince of historical mousers, the lamented Julien Havet, propounded a more satisfying theory.<sup>4</sup> It is not, he points out, a call to arms, but only a call for money—"a sort of circular, meant to be carried about by a collector of alms for the Christian establishments at Jerusalem." It may well have been written, Havet thinks, by Gerbert, but probably in the spring of 984, long before his papacy, and perhaps for the use of his friend the abbot Guarin, known to have been interested in this collection of alms for the Holy Land.

So passes one of the most famous of the antecedents of the Crusades. And with it, at the hands of the critics—they are again Harttung and Riant—has fallen the bull ostensibly called forth by the Moslem destruction of the Holy Sepulchre in 1010. Pope Sergius, addressing the princes and prelates of Catholic Christen-

<sup>1</sup> *Forschungen zur Deutschen Geschichte*, XVII. 390–396 (Göttingen, 1877). The article is called *Zur Vorgeschichte des ersten Kreuzzuges*.

<sup>2</sup> In his *Inventaire des Lettres Historiques des Croisades*, in the *Archives de l'Orient Latin*, I. (Paris, 1881.)

<sup>3</sup> Wattenbach and his colleagues, in the edition of 1885. In Jaffé's original edition it does not appear.

<sup>4</sup> In his edition of the *Lettres de Gerbert*, 983–987 (Paris, 1889), p. 22, note.

dom, summons them to a common expedition for the delivery of the holy places. This document, which exists in but a single manuscript, and that a transcript, though of the eleventh century, they deem a clumsy forgery, produced in the days of the First Crusade. As to its motive they are not at one. With it must pass from credence the expedition said by it to be preparing by Venice and Genoa,—as there had already fallen the legend (based on more misunderstanding) of Pisan exploits of this period in the Levant.

As the earliest summons to the Holy War against Islam, then, there remain the famous letters of Pope Gregory VII., in 1074. Of these (excepting that to the Countess Matilda) the genuineness is not questioned; but later historians, following Von Sybel, see in them less than did the earlier. What they mainly urge is the rescue not of the Holy Land, but of Asia Minor; their motive, politic not less than pious, is the salvation of the Greek church and the restoration of Armenian orthodoxy; their means, not an armed pilgrimage of Latin Christendom, but an invading army. And such as it was, the enterprise was with Gregory but a passing impulse.

For the conception, then, as well as for the initiation, of the Crusades proper we are brought to their very eve. To discuss the sources and the legends of the First Crusade is the task of another. Yet from this hasty survey of the havoc wrought by modern criticism among their antecedents, it must not be gathered that to present-day scholars the Crusades had no remoter causes. They are to be sought still in the ascetic spirit and the theocratic ideals of the age, in the love of travel and of venture, begotten in it by pilgrimage, in the over-population of the West, in the rise of chivalry and in the intolerable havoc wrought by its private wars, in the Church's assumption by the Truce of God to check and even to direct its energies, above all in those brilliant enterprises of the eleventh century, suggested or sanctioned by the Church, which appealed alike to the piety, the valor, and the ambition of every knightly soul—the deeds of the Normans in England, in Italy, in the Greek Empire, the beating back of the Moors in Spain, the African raids of the Italian sea-powers. Let, then, the century's last word on the deeper causes of the Crusades be that of Bishop Stubbs: "They were the first great effort of medieval life to go beyond the pursuit of selfish and isolated ambitions; they were the trial-feat of the young world, essaying to use, to the glory of God and the benefit of man, the arms of its new knighthood."

GEORGE LINCOLN BURR.

## THE POLITICAL INFLUENCE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF PARIS IN THE MIDDLE AGES

THE University of Paris was distinguished from all other universities of the Middle Ages by its prominence in political affairs. While the great schools of Italy, Germany, and England held aloof from secular politics, the *civitas philosophorum* on Mt. Ste. Geneviève often asserted itself as a potent factor in the political life of France. The learned doctors of Paris seem indeed often to have been more interested in the strife of party factions than in the disputationes of their scholars, and at times the University acted as if it were an important organ of the state rather than a school of learning.<sup>1</sup>

We hear little of its participation in political affairs before the years 1356-1358, when it took part in the stirring events associated with the name of Étienne Marcel. Its political rôle in the conflict between Marcel and the Dauphin of France has often been exaggerated. The University was twice called upon to mediate between the two parties, but did not openly espouse the cause of either faction, though it was inclined to favor the cause of the Dauphin.<sup>2</sup>

It does not seem to have intervened in secular politics during the reign of Charles V. (1364-1380), but came into political prominence under his successor, Charles VI., especially during the struggle between the Burgundians and Armagnacs. In fact, the years 1405-1422 comprise the period when the University was most active in the affairs of the state. During this period it was usually in sympathy with the Burgundians, but strove to mediate between the two parties and to establish peace.

Its attitude as a peace-maker is illustrated by many documents in the *Chartularium*. In 1405 the rector and divers "solemn" doctors admonished the Duke of Orléans to look to the refor-

<sup>1</sup> The older historians of the University, Du Boulay, Crevier, and Dubarle, devote little attention to its political activity, but some of the documents in Du Boulay's book are useful. Nor does this subject fall within the scope of the first volume of Denifle's epoch-making work (*Die Universitäten des Mittelalters*, 1885). It is briefly examined in Rashdall's *Universities of the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1895), Vol. I., Ch. V., § 6. The fourth volume of Denifle's *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis* (Paris, 1897), which covers the years 1394-1452, now enables the investigator adequately to deal with the subject.

<sup>2</sup> Jourdain, in *Revue des Questions Historiques*, 1878, XXIV. 548-566; and in his *Excursions Historiques* (Paris, 1888), 339-361.

tion of the realm and to effect a reconciliation with the Duke of Burgundy. Louis of Orléans angrily retorted: "As you do not consult knights in questions of religion, so you ought not to meddle in questions of war; therefore return to your books and attend to your own affairs, for, though the University is called the daughter of the king, she should not interfere with the government of the kingdom."<sup>1</sup> In 1408 Gerson, on behalf of the University, strove to reconcile the two dukes;<sup>2</sup> and in 1410 certain masters were sent to exhort the Duke of Berri to establish peace "for the honor and welfare of the king and the kingdom." The deputation was instructed to state that in the dissensions between the princes of the royal house the University wishes to act as "the loyal daughter of the king," to refrain from all partisanship, and to mediate by exhorting both parties to make peace, for it is her duty by reason of her profession (*ex sua professione*) to work for peace, "as she always has been accustomed to do."<sup>3</sup> After their interview with the Duke of Berri the deputies requested the King to restore tranquillity by removing the heads of the two parties (the Dukes of Berri and Burgundy) from the government and by replacing them with men devoted to the public welfare. This proposition was accepted and carried out.<sup>4</sup> In 1410 and again in 1412 the University implored the Duke of Burgundy to establish peace in the realm.<sup>5</sup> It also sent delegates to various councils assembled to deliberate concerning terms of peace (for example, at Auxerre in 1412, at Pontoise in 1413, at Troyes in 1420, at Arras in 1435),<sup>6</sup> and issued letters confirming or approving treaties of peace.<sup>7</sup> In 1413, at a congregation of the University at which the Dukes of Guienne, Berri, and Burgundy, with many other magnates, were present, the chancellor of the Duke of Guienne solemnly rendered thanks to the assembled masters for having labored zealously to establish peace.<sup>8</sup>

During Charles VI's reign the rector and masters also exhibited much zeal for the improvement of the government of France. In 1405, in presence of the princes of the royal house, Gerson (*ex parte universitatis*) delivered an oration on the reformation of the chief

<sup>1</sup> *Chartularium*, IV. 135.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, IV. 160.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, IV. 188. In 1432 and 1444 the University again asserts that "by reason of her profession" she strives for the peace and tranquillity of the realm. (*Ibid.*, IV. 547, 646.)

<sup>4</sup> *Chronique du Religieux de Saint-Denys*, IV. 372-384; cf. Valois, *Le Grand Conseil*, 118-120.

<sup>5</sup> *Chartularium*, IV. 189, 239-241; see also *ibid.*, IV. 547.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, IV. 241, 259, 377, 565-571.

<sup>7</sup> For example, in 1413 and 1420 (*ibid.*, IV. 259, 261, 380).

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, IV. 261.

branches of government, especially the king's council, the judiciary, the army, and taxation ; he said that "the daughter of the king" is, as it were, the eye of France, which must always be vigilant for the welfare of the realm.<sup>1</sup> Again, in 1413, in presence of the King, Gerson indicated (*nomine universitatis*) how the evils of the past might be avoided and how the realm might be well governed in the future.<sup>2</sup> In 1413 the University took a very prominent part in the agitation which led to the adoption of the Cabochian Ordinance, the Magna Charta of medieval France ;<sup>3</sup> and in 1416 the rector and various doctors deliberated with the Parlement of Paris as to the measures which should be taken against evil-doers who pillage the king's subjects.<sup>4</sup>

The political activity of the University also manifests itself in the relations of France to foreign powers, especially to England. In 1412 the rector and masters write to the King that the English should be driven from the duchy of Normandy, which they have invaded ; similar letters were sent to the Dukes of Guienne and Burgundy,<sup>5</sup> and in 1418 the University beseeches the King and the Duke of Burgundy to relieve Rouen, which is besieged by the English.<sup>6</sup> Soon afterwards, however, we find the rector and masters acting in sympathy with England. In 1420 they accepted the Treaty of Troyes, and in 1422 gave thanks because Henry V. had taken Melun from Charles VII. ; in 1424 they celebrated the victories of the English over the French, and urged Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, to desist from his plan of warfare against the Duke of Burgundy because such warfare might endanger the union of France and England.<sup>7</sup> The University also manifested much zeal in the persecution of Joan of Arc.<sup>8</sup>

After Charles VII. had succeeded in making headway against the English and in asserting his authority in France, it could not be expected that he should look with favor on the Parisian masters who had consorted with his enemies in the dark days preceding the advent of Joan of Arc. In the second half of his reign the University was no longer a power in the political life of France ; and

<sup>1</sup> *Chartularium*, IV. 136; Schwab, *Gerson*, 417.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, IV. 261.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, IV. 252-253, 257; Coville, *Les Cabochiens* (Paris, 1888). Coville, pp. 115-133, gives an interesting account of the political influence and political theories of the University.

<sup>4</sup> *Chartularium*, IV. 320.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, IV. 243-244.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, IV. 357. The rector and masters also issued a proclamation calling upon the French cities to aid the King against the English, "the ancient enemies" of France (*Ibid.*, IV. 355-356).

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, IV. 380, 403, 435, 437; see also *ibid.*, IV. 413.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, IV. 510-528. For the relations of the University to Henry V. and Henry VI. (1420-1437), see Jourdain, *Excursions Historiques*, 311-335.

in 1446 one of the bulwarks of its ancient independence was swept away by a royal edict which made the University subject to the jurisdiction of the Parlement of Paris.<sup>1</sup> Another of the most precious academic privileges, exemption from taxation, was also assailed by that monarch.<sup>2</sup> While his son Louis XI. sat on the throne, "the eldest daughter" of the king was under stern parental control which would not brook any interference in political affairs. In 1467 Louis informed a deputation of the University that the old practice of meddling with the quarrels of princes must not be renewed,<sup>3</sup> and there is no evidence that it was renewed during his reign. In 1483, when the rector and masters approved the treaty of peace between Louis XI. and Maximilian of Austria, they simply acted as the docile instrument of the crown: they had been commanded to give their approval to the treaty, and they answered that they were always "ready to do all that the king may be pleased to order."<sup>4</sup> In 1485, during the minority of Louis XI.'s successor, Louis of Orléans asked the University for its support against Anne of Beaujeu, the regent of France, but it prudently refrained from interfering in the strife of factions.<sup>5</sup> When Louis of Orléans became King of France he refused to recognize the right of the University to suspend its lectures and sermons, and hence in 1499 this ancient weapon of academic aggression was used for the last time.<sup>6</sup> Thus under Charles VII. and his three successors the independence and influence of the great corporation of masters gradually declined, and the University ceased to be a political power.

Having determined the scope of its political activity, we are now prepared to deal with the causes which led the University to assert itself in politics. First it should be noted that the position of the rector and masters as an independent and privileged corporation, accustomed to self-government and free discussion, gave them a consciousness of strength and an aptitude for political agitation. Then, too, the situation of the University in a great capital brought the academic body in close touch with the political life of France. Moreover, this body was well adapted to diffuse political ideas and to mould public opinion; for its masters filled most of the pulpits in Paris and held many benefices in other parts of France.<sup>7</sup> Therefore the approbation of the University was courted by the king and by the leaders of party factions. For example, in 1411 Charles VI.

<sup>1</sup> *Chartularium*, IV. 669.

<sup>2</sup> Beaucourt, *Histoire de Charles VII.*, IV. 326.

<sup>3</sup> Du Boulay, V. 681.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, V. 755-757.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, V. 767; Crevier, IV. 417-419.

<sup>6</sup> Du Boulay, V. 830-834; Dubarle, I. 337-339.

<sup>7</sup> Rashdall, *Universities*, I. 421; cf. *ibid.*, I. 532-535; *Chartularium*, IV. 648.

complained that the Dukes of Berri and Orléans were trying to destroy his authority, and requested the rector and masters to cause this fact "to be published and preached in churches and elsewhere throughout the realm."<sup>1</sup>

The various circumstances or considerations which we have thus far set forth do not suffice, however, to explain the political rôle of the University; they were simply conditions which would favor or facilitate the exercise of political power. In seeking the true explanation of this power, we must remember that the activity of the University in public affairs was largely confined to the reign of Charles VI.; in no other reign did the rector and masters take the initiative in secular politics. It is not surprising that during the disorders of the first quarter of the fourteenth century, when a mad king sat on the throne and the realm was rent asunder by party strife, the great school of Paris should exert its influence in behalf of peace and good government. It would feel impelled to do this by a mere sense of patriotic duty (*ex sua professione*); for the rector and masters held a high place in the religious and educational world, and their opinions on any subject would naturally receive attention. They were aroused to action by the appalling condition of things in France, by "the pitiable desolation of the realm," by "the iniquities intolerable and painful to the hearts of all good Frenchmen."<sup>2</sup> Moreover, the material welfare of the University and at times even its very existence seemed to be jeopardized by the struggle between the Burgundians and Armagnacs. In 1410 the rector informs the King that the University is inclined to abandon Paris, because, owing to the depredations of the troops of both factions, food cannot be provided and property is unprotected;<sup>3</sup> and in 1418 the rector joins with the Parlement of Paris in a request that the King should take measures against these troops, in order that the necessities of life may not be wanting in Paris.<sup>4</sup> Again, in 1412 the Dukes of Orléans and Berri tried, for political reasons, to secure the removal of the University from Paris.<sup>5</sup> We should scarcely expect the rector and masters to remain passive when the body politic of France was paralyzed and the University itself was threatened with ruin.

The prominence of the University in the Great Schism may also have given an impulse to its activity in the affairs of the state. The

<sup>1</sup> *Chartularium*, IV. 219.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, IV. 188-189, 241, 259-260, 355.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, IV. 191.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, IV. 351. In 1410 the rector and masters complained of the desolate condition of Paris, and in 1418 deliberated with the Parlement concerning the lack of provisions and fuel in Paris (*ibid.*, IV. 189, 354).

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, IV. 235.

discord in the Church concerned the welfare of all the nations of western Europe; kings as well as prelates were interested in the strife between the rival popes. Throughout the struggle, therefore, we find all kinds of politics intermingled, religious and secular, national and international. The University, as a great organ of the Church, was soon engaged in making zealous efforts to bring the Schism to an end, but its zeal was often leavened by the fiats of princes. Thus in 1379 Charles V. virtually coerced the rector and masters to declare for Clement VII.; in 1381 the Duke of Anjou, the regent of France, opposed their efforts to promote harmony by means of a general council; in 1391 Charles VI. imposed silence upon them when they exhorted him to secure the union of the Church; in 1394 the King permitted them to find some way of ending the Schism, and appointed deputies to confer with them on this subject.<sup>1</sup> In 1381 a contemporary poet exhorts the king to allow the masters greater freedom of speech in the discussion of the Schism:

„ Roy, leisse seurement les clercs de Paris fere  
Sermens, disputoisons au pour et au contraire.”<sup>2</sup>

In fact, at every stage of the great struggle secular as well as religious politics are visible, and in the conciliar movement the University, like a sovereign power, negotiates with the French crown, with the rival popes, and with continental princes. Now we venture to suggest that its efforts in behalf of peace and reform in the Church would naturally prepare the way for the exercise of its influence in behalf of peace and reform in the kingdom of France during the dark days of Charles VI.: the semi-secular activity of the rector and masters in church politics would predispose them to participate in the purely secular politics of France.

Thus the disorders of the time of Charles VI., which threatened the kingdom of France and the University of Paris with ruin, coupled with the prominent rôle which the latter had already played in ecclesiastical politics, sufficiently explain its prominent rôle in public affairs during the first quarter of the fourteenth century. If these disorders and the impotence of the crown had continued under Charles VII. and Louis XI., the University would probably have held its place as an important factor in the political life of the nation. As the weakness of the papacy gave the University the opportunity to assert its authority in the Church, so the weakness of the crown gave it the opportunity to assert its authority in the state.

CHARLES GROSS.

<sup>1</sup> *Chartularium*, III. 564, 583, 595, 603. For other illustrations see *ibid.*, III. 552-639; and Valois, *La France et le Grand Schisme* (2 vols., Paris, 1896).

<sup>2</sup> Valois, I. 350.

## THE RISE OF METROPOLITAN JOURNALISM, 1800-1840

THE mechanical evolution of the modern newspaper is due chiefly to the steam-engine and the telegraph, but the evolution of the modern journalistic spirit is due chiefly to an aggressive democracy. Probably in no other country in the world has the press been so intimately connected with the inmost springs of the life of all political parties. No other nation has produced such a reading democracy as ours.

Democracy demands publicity. This great leveling force, pulling down on one side while it builds up on the other, is naturally hostile to any concealments and evasions of purpose or action. It scoffs at pretensions to esoteric wisdom. It revolts against secret machinations, as perilous to that régime of common consent which democracy calls "Law." From such reasons sprang those occasional popular frenzies against some secret fraternities, frenzies which shattered the Masonic order in 1829-1830, and which have buried the American, or Know-Nothing party, under forty years of obloquy. Upon the triumph of the democratic principle, therefore, the newspaper has been peculiarly dependent. It is, in theory at least, the very temple and shrine of Publicity. In fact, the newspapers, scattered throughout the body politic, act as lungs through which our system of representative party government draws most easily its vital breath.

To the mass of people the controllers of influential journals are the real managers of the great world's stage. They set the scene. They put the words into the players' mouths. They call attention to the moral which adorns the tale. "There's nothing," says the rattle-pated city editor in a recent story, "there's nothing like original news to show the influence of journalism. One morning, after the cakes had been bad for a week, I said to my landlady that I believed the fault must be in the buckwheat. She said 'No, she didn't think so, for the flour looked very nice indeed.' That day I put a line in the 'Local Glimpses' columns saying that unfortunately the buckwheat this year was of inferior quality. The very next morning she apologized to me, said I was right, the buckwheat was bad, she had read so in *The Chronicle*."

The expansion of democracy in the United States has found a constant index and gauge in the evolution of the newspaper. As democratic sentiment among us took form and produced the organs of political party life, the journals changed from mere bill-boards to party-organs, and from party-organs to newspapers, obedient finally to the demands of Publicity rather than to those of Party. Prior to 1830 every paper was intended to be the preacher of some partisan gospel. It was filled with personal squibs or stump-speeches and published such stray items of general news as fell easily into its possession.

Glancing back for an instant at the beginnings of journalism in the eighteenth century, we see at once that the colonial press was in no wise a framer or leader of public opinion. Those papers were its humble and passive channels. Neither were they newspapers in our sense of the term. They were bulletin-boards on which were plastered the political arguments or purposes of factions and parties. Provincial New York had more clearly antagonistic political parties than any other colony. The two parties, popular and aristocratic, were somewhat evenly balanced in New York City and each had its chosen journalistic organ since the first quarter of the eighteenth century. Bradford's *Gazette* was founded in 1729 to be the mouth-piece of the royal governors and of the aristocratic party; Zenger's *Journal* was established in 1733 to be the similar representative of the popular opposition. As the most favored Tory organ, Bradford's *Gazette* was succeeded in the decade 1750 to 1760 by Hugh Gaine's *Mercury*, and in the era of the Revolution by James Rivington's *Gazette*. The office of this paper was sacked and its types destroyed by a mob of Sons of Liberty, who would not permit freedom of the press except to their own publication. This paper, called Holt's *Journal*, was the direct successor of Zenger's *Journal*, and the proprietor, John Holt, was a prominent patriot and Son of Liberty. All these papers were weekly; the first daily paper in New York City was the *Daily Advertiser*, founded in 1785, of which the poet Freneau was for a short time the editor in 1789-1790.<sup>1</sup> The proprietor of Holt's *Journal* was now dead, but under different names and through some vicissitudes of fortune this paper remained true to its original political affiliations with radical democracy.

At the beginning of this century the New York City instrument of the Jeffersonian democracy was the lineal descendant and representative of Holt's paper. It was then called the *American Citizen*. Its editor was an Englishman named James Cheetham, a

<sup>1</sup>The first daily newspaper in the country was the *American Daily Advertiser*, issued at Philadelphia in 1784, and now merged in the paper known as the *North American*.

master of invective, who was proud to be called an American Junius. When the breach between Burr and the Clintons occurred in 1801, Cheetham became the scribe of the latter faction. He assailed Burr not only through the columns of the *Citizen* but by a running fire of anonymous pamphlets, charging upon Burr the crime of treachery to Jefferson and to the party in the late presidential election. The friends of Burr defended him in the *Morning Chronicle*, which they established in 1802 under the supervision of an elder brother of Washington Irving. This journal canonized Burr and denounced the ambitious oligarchy of Livingstons and Clintons.

The organ of the outgoing Federalist administration was the *Commercial Advertiser*, still in existence, the dean of the metropolitan daily newspapers. This paper had been founded in 1793 by Noah Webster, and had at first borne a classic name, the *Daily Minerva*, suggestive of its famous founder's Yale education. Alexander Hamilton and the Federalists who followed his fortunes also possessed a newspaper battery. This was the *Evening Post*, founded in 1801, and edited by William Coleman, a Massachusetts gentleman and a lawyer. He had been a municipal office-holder, but De Witt Clinton's new broom swept him out of office in August 1801, and the *Post* was established in the following November. The New York *Evening Post* owes its existence to the first application of the "spoils" theory in our political system. Mr. Coleman and Dr. Irving of the *Chronicle* were both men of erudition and scholarly tastes, but Irving could compete with neither Coleman nor Cheetham in spiteful vigor of expression. These gentlemen filled the small space reserved from advertisements with malicious paragraphs about each other, or with furious diatribes against the leaders of opposing parties. A few local chronicles and a bare summary of foreign news six or eight weeks old occasionally appeared. Jefferson's first message in 1801 was printed in the *Post* on the twelfth of December, 1801. It was in no wise referred to until the seventeenth, when some contributor, presumably Alexander Hamilton, hid behind the dignified Roman mask of "Lucius Crassus," and discharged a resounding volley at the message.

Cheetham and Coleman were soon embroiled, and Coleman wrote of "the insolent vulgarity of that base wretch." Duane, of the Philadelphia *Aurora*, was another of Coleman's antagonists, and on one occasion the latter hit both his birds with one stone, thus :

"Lie on, Duane, lie on for pay,  
And Cheetham, lie thou too;  
More against truth you cannot say  
Than truth can say 'gainst you."

The third corner of the triangular fight was well maintained, for although Dr. Irving was amiable, some of Burr's friends were equally ready with pen or pistol. The scurrities of these faction-fights ripened into a harvest of duels. One day Matthew L. Davis, of Burr's Myrmidons, patrolled Wall Street, weapon in hand, expecting to slay Cheetham on sight. A challenge from Cheetham to Coleman led to a bloody fight between Coleman and Harbor-master Thompson in which the latter was shot to death.

None of these New York city papers wielded much influence outside of the city and its vicinity. The mentor of the Democratic Republican journals of the state was the *Albany Evening Register*. That paper had the advantage of location, for the state officers were residents at Albany and frequent contributors to the columns of the *Register*. It was the bulletin-board of the leading Clintonian politicians of the state. It was the paper which chiefly influenced members of the legislature while in session. Above all, its proprietors were sure of an income from the public printing. As for news, Albany or any other inland point was in those days almost as well situated as New York. There was no competition in the dissemination of the latest intelligence. Partisan information was desired, and in that department the *Register* could speak with authority.

When De Witt Clinton, covered with the reproach of his opposition to Madison in 1812, was cast out of the Republican synagogue, the *Register* fell with him into the outer darkness of "Clinton's big ditch." The new commanders of democracy, Martin Van Buren and others associated with Governor Tompkins, promptly established, January 26, 1813, a new paper called the *Argus*, to feed at the state printing crib, and to act as file-leader for all the orthodox Republican newspapers of the state. They selected as its editor a moderate and discreet man named Jesse Buel, who could be depended upon to obey orders. Any important proclamations were contributed directly by some member of the Regency, Marcy, Wright, Dix, or even by Van Buren himself. The country editors of the Bucktail faith scanned the *Argus* for the materials of leading articles in their weekly issues, and they accepted its opinions as inspired revelations. And they were. No man could become editor of the *Argus* unless he was acceptable to the Regency. "Without a paper thus edited at Albany," wrote Mr. Van Buren to Jesse Hoyt in 1823, "we may hang our harps on the willows. With it the party can survive a thousand convulsions." In that year the oracle was intrusted to the discretion of a young hierophant named Edwin Croswell. Mr. Croswell was

well adapted for the mysteries of political management. Although an unswerving partisan, he was cool and cautious in temperament. Sagacious judgment enhanced the value of his considerable executive abilities, and his contemporaries were surprised that a man, whose training had been purely practical, should infuse so much literary taste and skill into the acrimony and vulgarity of petty politics. Under the Croswell dynasty, which endured until 1855, the *Argus* touched the zenith of authority and influence. Mr. Edwin Croswell was admitted to the inmost circles of the Regency, and not even Mr. Van Buren himself was more cunning in the distribution of either commands or loaves and fishes. While Jackson and Van Buren sat on the throne, the *Argus* was one of a trio of party organs which represented the three chief centres of Democratic intrigue. Croswell in the *Argus* made known the will of the Albany Regency. Francis P. Blair in the *Washington Globe* spoke for the Kitchen Cabinet, and Father Thomas Ritchie, "old Momentous Crisis" Ritchie, displayed in the *Richmond Enquirer* the flag of the venerable Richmond Junta, the successors of Jefferson, Madison and Monroe. No triplet of party organs, before or since, exerted such unquestioned power. These papers, as Hudson says, "made cabinet officers and custom-house weighers, presidents and tide-waiters, editors and envoys. They regulated state legislatures and dictated state policies. They were the father confessors to the democracy of the country."

For the second or Whig Albany Regency Thurlow Weed's *Albany Evening Journal* was the accredited organ. The *Evening Journal* was never however the prompter of the Whig newspaper chorus as the *Argus* had been for their Democratic contemporaries. Neither did the machine of Seward and Weed ever obey the word of command so readily as Van Buren's. The Whig leaders directed a more intelligent, and consequently a less pliant party. The *Journal* enjoyed the advantage of the unique and powerful personality of its editor, Thurlow Weed, who was under no man's thumb and who wielded a far greater individual influence than Croswell of the *Argus* could ever claim.

Thurlow Weed and Edwin Croswell were together from 1830 to 1848 the foremost journalist-politicians in the state of New York. Side by side upon that Albany hill they patrolled the picket lines of their opposing hosts or sounded the reveille for the retainers of Seward or Van Buren. Weed's post was at once more honorable and more onerous. Croswell was at best only Van Buren's chief of staff, but no man could tell where Weed's power ended and Seward's began. Governor Seward's ornate eloquence and unerr-

ing phraseology fired the popular heart, but Weed held the workers in leash like a master of the hounds. He had become the master of a simple, direct, and powerful editorial style, but his influence depended little on his controversial paragraphs, pungent as they were. Personal acquaintance was his main reliance, and with habitual cleverness he made the columns of his newspaper contribute to these resources. There was a column in the *Evening Journal* in which Weed used to make personal mention of his friends and foes in short articles, varying from a line and a half to a dozen or fifteen lines in length. "That column," says Dyer, "was a prodigious power in the politics of the state of New York. There was seldom a young man in any part of the state, who gave promise of becoming a person of influence, that was not kindly and flattering mentioned in that column, no matter to what party he belonged." To the young and aspiring Whig politician, that kindly allusion in the most prominent newspaper of his party often seemed like a glowing promise that his humble merit should not lose its reward. The young Democrat also, who was revolving in the obscure orbit to which the Regency had appointed him, and who perhaps had believed both the *Evening Journal* and its editors to be of villainy all compact, was some day surprised and gratified to find that Weed had printed a flattering notice of him, in which regretful reference to his politics was mingled with admiring acknowledgment of his abilities. His opinion of the Whig leader and of the Whig paper changed rapidly. He mailed copies of the *Journal* to all his friends. Perhaps he called on Weed, and was received with winning cordiality. He concluded that his veteran foe was not so black as he was painted, and he returned home to wonder why the editor of the *Argus* was so much less clear-sighted than his rival of the *Journal*. All this strategy on Weed's part was surely not journalism, but it was excellent politics. By such means Weed obtained some power of manipulating the machinery of both parties, and his influence was the more valuable because it was so secret and intangible.

It was not and is not likely that journalist-politicians like Weed and Croswell could contribute much to the institutional development of the newspaper. They subordinated the journalist to the politician, as their predecessors had done before them, and the grinding of the party organ was sufficiently musical to their ears. But in the very heyday of their fame and vigor, a new spirit was beginning to move upon the waters especially in New York City.

The beginning of the second quarter of this century was a period of intellectual unrest and fermentation. In Europe there

was political revolution ; in this country there was Jackson's tumultuous democracy. Anti-Masonry, Abolitionism, and Transcendentalism were, all three, the tokens—and products too—of a great moral awakening. The foundations of social order seemed to be crumbling under the test of destructive criticism. The tablets of the old theology were ground to powder in Boston, and in New York the first of our workingmen's parties began its courageous attacks upon the laws of political economy. Saviors of society appeared here and there, impostors like Joseph Smith and Matthias, and apostles of humanity like Robert Owen. The socialistic seed sown in Europe by Saint-Simon, Cabet and Fourier took root upon our soil and finally produced a harvest of enthusiastic communities and phalanxes, harbingers of a new heaven and new earth wherein should dwell righteousness. These preliminary New Jerusalems usually forbade marriage, and then came Sylvester Graham, commanding to abstain also from meats and prophesying regeneration by the use of unbolted flour, oatmeal and beans. All this running to and fro increased an appetite for knowledge, and the men were already in existence who would re-organize the press to meet the new demands.

In the political world the crowd was newly emancipated from colonial and aristocratic traditions and laws, newly vocal with enthusiasm for a democratic hero, Old Hickory, and willing to pose before the rest of the world. A new conception of journalistic functions began to take shape. The newspaper must adapt itself to meet the crowd. It must become the representative of the multitude rather than a few. Even while the violence of partisanship did not abate, the former proportions of general news and of partisan propaganda were gradually reversed. In this evolution the journalist began to differentiate himself from the politician, and journalism began to emerge as a distinct profession.

It was natural that these changes should be most significant and interesting in the field of New York City journalism. Thanks to Martin Van Buren and Thurlow Weed, New York contained the best organized and most eager democracy in the Union. Thanks to the enterprise of its own business men, and subsequently to the policy of DeWitt Clinton, New York City had become the metropolis of the country, wherein the new journalism could find its best and largest audience.

The leading political papers in New York City in 1829 were the *Courier and Enquirer*, a Democratic sheet of the old-fashioned sort ; the *Journal of Commerce*, which may be described as " Adams Anti-Slavery ;" and the *Evening Post*, Jacksonian. The commer-

cial and advertisement bulletins, like the *Gazette* or the *Commercial Advertiser*, could count perhaps a larger circulation, which scarcely reached in either case a daily issue of two thousand copies; but these papers never aspired to represent public sentiment. For that honor, there was brisk competition between the *Courier and Enquirer* and the *Journal of Commerce*, both sixpenny morning papers, and both catering to the political tastes of the mercantile classes.

The *Evening Post* rested on a narrower basis. It was, as it has always been, the favorite of the small cultivated class, and it had already been immortalized by the famous "Croaker" literature of Fitz Greene Halleck and Joseph Rodman Drake. The paper passed in 1829 from the hands of the dying Coleman into the control of William Leggett and William Cullen Bryant. These two editors, both young and ardent, and both poets, were happily described in the columns of the *Courier and Enquirer* as "the chanting cherubs of the *Post*," a title which clung to them for years.

Under Mr. Bryant, who became the responsible editor in 1836, the *Post* naturally perfected that literary flavor which it had acquired from the doctrinaire Coleman and the brilliant Leggett. Mr. Bryant was neither a great journalist nor a politician. The force of the *Post* as a newspaper was small, and its political influence was necessarily limited. Mr. Bryant's best service to journalism was his consistent exposition of the ideals of a scholarly and cultivated gentleman; but his professional brethren and rivals were often angered by his didactic tone, and made unkind allusions to the phylacteries of the Pharisees.

Mr. Bryant's catholic moderation of judgment lent to his political opinions a noteworthy consistency in conservatism. To Van Buren democracy the *Evening Post* was attached without variability or shadow of turning. Satisfied with the general principles of that party concerning free-trade, slavery and hard-money, Bryant and the *Post* blindly followed all the Van Burenite twistings throughout the Free Soil period, and finally fell with the rest of the anti-slavery democrats into the yet inchoate mass of the Republican party. Throughout the whole era of the war, it represented the sentiment of that democratic element in the new party. Since the war it has returned with that same clientage to its old political affinities, a most remarkable instance of permanence in the political relations of a metropolitan newspaper.

The *Courier and Enquirer*, in 1829, was the property of James Watson Webb, a wealthy, hot-headed young aristocrat, who would have been more congenially placed among the fire-eaters of the Palmetto State than in democratic New York. The possession

of pecuniary resources enabled Webb to command efficient service and thus the *Courier* acquired a dignity and importance to which the mercurial, impulsive temperament of the proprietor and senior editor was always the principal drawback. Col. Webb's West Point education did not tend to curb his ebullient spirits or to diminish his punctilious sensitiveness concerning his honor. The sword, the pistol, the walking-cane and the fist were all handier if not mightier weapons than the pen to him. Several times he assaulted the proprietor of the *Herald* in the street. More than once he journeyed post-haste to Washington to pull the nose or let the blood of some magnate who had breathed too carelessly upon the name of Webb. Only the interposition of Governor Seward's pardon in 1842 saved Webb from serving two years in the state's prison for fighting a duel on a Sunday with Hon. Thomas F. Marshall of Kentucky. The elaborate bombast and grandiloquence with which Webb described these encounters are among the most amusing reminiscences of New York journalism.<sup>1</sup>

If Col. Webb's excitable energy could have been legitimately and sensibly directed in the field of his ostensible profession, he might have founded a great newspaper. Even as it was, a very considerable stimulus in newspaper enterprise was derived from him. The *Courier* and *Enquirer* entered into lively competition with the *Journal of Commerce* for the first possession of news from Europe. From 1830 to 1834 these papers kept fast-sailing schooners and clipper ships off Sandy Hook to intercept incoming steamers and to carry up the harbor if possible some "exclusive" news. The *Courier* and the *Journal of Commerce* during the years named spent from \$15,000 to \$20,000 a year on their news-schooners. Their rivalries occasionally contributed to the gayety of the town. Once when the clipper *Ajax* was about due from Europe, the *Courier* printed a postscript to the effect that the *Ajax* had come and brought news, a summary of which followed. A few copies were printed with this postscript and left at doors near the office of the *Journal of Commerce*. Watchers saw when one was "borrowed" and the others were taken up and destroyed. The *Courier's* regular edition was then printed without the postscript. The *Journal*,

<sup>1</sup> Witness the laborious elegance of his account of the famous assault upon Duff Green, editor of the Washington *Telegraph*: "After looking at him in silence for some seconds, I placed under my arm the walking-cane which I used, and leaned against the south jamb of the door, addressing him in the following terms which are still fresh in my recollection: 'You poor contemptible, cowardly puppy, do you not feel that you are a coward and that every drop of blood that courses through your veins is of the same kind of hue as your complexion? Contemptible and degraded as you are,' etc., etc., *ad libitum*.

however, was filled with "News by the *Ajax*." Everybody said, "The *Journal* is ahead of the *Courier* again," until the truth came out that the *Ajax* had not arrived, and then everybody laughed at the *Journal*. From 1833 to 1835 the two papers, under the initiative of Hale and Hallock, proprietors of the *Journal of Commerce*, organized daily pony expresses from Washington, but that experiment was too enterprising to endure.

The vitality of these papers was all expended in these spasmodic attempts to collect news and in a more serious effort to surpass each other in the size of their blanket sheets. They measured success by the square foot of white paper in a page, and this ludicrous contest absorbed their energies for years. The *Courier and Enquirer* plumed itself in 1850 on being 68 square inches larger than the *London Times* and on containing more than twice as many ems of printed matter. In March, 1853, the *Journal of Commerce* beat this record and measured  $14\frac{1}{2}$  square feet to the sheet, which meant that each page of the journal contained  $76\frac{1}{8}$  square inches more than a page of the *Courier*.

The tone of these journals was very stately, except when referring to each other. The political articles were long and labored, the references to current events were meagre and veiled in ample rhetoric. The same dignity characterized the business management. Papers were sold only over the counter or by the regular carriers. In those days, if Col. Webb had heard a ragged urchin bawling the name of the *Courier and Enquirer* in the streets, he would have cuffed the lad soundly for his presumption, and wondered what Machiavellian ingenuity had contrived this insult also. Annual subscriptions were universally accepted on a credit system and advertisements were inserted for a long time in advance on the same plan of payment. "The result was that so late as 1850, when New York City had a population of half a million, a sixpenny blanket sheet like the *Journal of Commerce* had a daily circulation of 4500, and Hallock thought that a yearly increase of 500 in that circulation was something to boast of."

James Watson Webb merited the laurels of Fame for the same reason that gave Louis XIV. the title of "Great," because of the eminent men whom he gathered around him. The *Courier and Enquirer* became the foster-mother of nearly all the bright young journalists of that generation, with the exception of Horace Greeley. Among these knights of the quill were Charles King, afterwards President of Columbia College, James K. Paulding, the novelist, afterwards Secretary of War, and Henry J. Raymond, the founder of the *New York Times*. But the most remarkable members of

Webb's group of lieutenants and associates were two men who entered his office in 1829 as part of the fixtures of the New York *Enquirer*. These were Mordecai Manasseh Noah and James Gordon Bennett. Major Noah's personality is more interesting to the psychologist than important to the historian. He was an Israelite, indeed, in whom there was much guile. Since 1816 he had been editor of the city organ of Tammany Hall, and an aspirant for various political offices, some of which he obtained. When he was a candidate for the shrievalty of New York City it was objected that a Jew ought not to be permitted to hang a Christian. "Pretty Christians," said Noah, "to require hanging at all!" Noah was a brilliant paragraphist, but too erratic and uneasy to make a durable impression in any calling. His vagaries touched occasionally on the verge of insanity, as when he attempted to gather all the lost tribes of Israel, among whom the Red Indians were to be included, into a new city on Grand Island in the Niagara River. Clad in a rich antique costume, he dedicated in September 1825, the corner-stone of the new Hebrew capital, and named the place "Ararat," in honor of his illustrious ancestor, the elder Noah.

The three men Webb, Noah, and Bennett, who were so closely associated in the conduct of the *Courier and Enquirer* in 1830, had not a few points in common. There was a dash of charlatany in all three. They were alive to the mercantile value of sensationalism. They were all restless spirits, anxious to magnify their office, and all were half-conscious of an enormous waste of latent force somewhere in the operation of the newspaper institution. More than one enthusiast in the renaissance of 1830 had already perceived the power that the press could exert, if it could arrest the attention of a larger circle of readers. To achieve this, the paper must contain news that everyone would wish to read, and must be cheap enough for everyone to buy.

A suggestion of the possibilities in this direction was already offered by the *Illustrated Penny Magazine*, which was issued in London in 1830, and was sold in large quantities in New York and other cities. Journalism for the millions was felt to be in the air, although the *Illustrated Penny Magazine* was in no sense a newspaper. The *Bostonian* in Boston and the *Cent* in Philadelphia were feeble and short-lived attempts to put the product of the printing-press within the reach of all. The first penny paper of any considerable pretension was the *Morning Post* which began publication in New York City, January 1, 1833. Dr. H. D. Shepard, Horace Greeley, and Francis V. Story ventured to start the enterprise upon a capital of \$200 and a combined credit scarcely equal to the pur-

chase of \$40 worth of type. The paper was at first sold for two cents, but after the first week, the price was lowered to one cent. At that price the paper lived for just two weeks more. It would not deserve this mention but for its influence upon Greeley's subsequent success.

Out of all the various attempts to make a cheap newspaper that could live, only three succeeded, each after its kind, the *Sun*, the *Herald*, and the *Tribune*. The *Sun* was the pioneer. It was first issued, September 3, 1833, by Benjamin H. Day, an intelligent workingman, and a job printer by occupation. There had been several similar experiments during the preceding year, but they had all come to a speedy and untimely end. The *Sun* was the first penny newspaper that endured and it remained a penny sheet until 1861. It started with a circulation of 300. Its first issue contained twelve columns of matter, each column ten inches long. It was at the outset chiefly an advertising medium, and had no political influence. It scarcely made room at that time for financial or market items, or even editorial notes. It was filled with bits of local news and with advertisements for "Help Wanted," but this made it popular with the masses in search of employment. The first large increase of the visible radiance of the *Sun* was derived from the lively imagination of its editor, Richard Adams Locke.

One day in 1835, Mr. Locke, who had formerly been a reporter for the *Courier and Enquirer*, made some discoveries about the moon, wrote out the details, attributed the article to a "Supplement of the *Edinburgh Philosophical Journal*," and published the story as "filling" in the columns of the *Sun*. The article purported to describe discoveries made by Sir John Herschel at the Cape of Good Hope, and related by him to the *Edinburgh Journal*. Sir John was then at the Cape and had set up a new telescope there. The story ran that his telescope had revealed everything on the surface of the moon, and had discovered inhabitants, houses, soil, crops, animals, and modes of living. Everyone believed it at first, and everyone bought the *Sun* to read about it. The large papers were sadly deceived. The *New York Daily Advertiser* said "Sir John has added a stock of knowledge to the present age that will immortalize his name, and place it high on the page of science." Other papers claimed to have received the news as soon as the *Sun* did, but asserted that it had until now been crowded out by pressure of reading matter. The *Albany Advertiser* stated that it had read in an Edinburgh scientific journal an account of discoveries by Sir John Herschel, discoveries that filled the editor, so he said, with "un-speakable emotions of pleasure and astonishment." The *New York*

*Herald* finally exposed the hoax, but the reputation of the *Sun* was made, and Mr. Day introduced steam power into his printing-office in order to keep up with the demand. The *Sun* was the pioneer in this mechanical improvement, as well as in the publication of such gigantic "fakes."

Shortly afterward the *Sun* passed into the hands of the Beach family, who retained its management for thirty years, 1837-1868. The *Sun* in those early days did not aspire to be an intellectual force in the community. It never quite escaped from the predominant character of a "want" newspaper, but the results of its pecuniary success were far-reaching. Here was a paper which wore no party uniform, scarcely seemed to entertain any political preferences, was subsidized by no party managers, and yet in two years it had acquired a larger circulation than any of its contemptuous comrades could show. It reached the working-people as they never did, and within ten years it had prospered enough to command the best facilities for the transmission of news from distant points. It was still more of an advertiser than a newspaper, and it lacked the weight of any strong individuality, but it had answered its problem.

Quite different, much more efficient, but equally independent solutions were shortly afterwards offered by two observant journalists, James Gordon Bennett and Horace Greeley. James Gordon Bennett was completely described in Parton's clever phrase, as a "man with a French intellect and Scotch habits." He was a native of Scotland, and was born and educated amid Catholic surroundings, but even in youth the bonds of that faith rested very lightly upon him. He declared that the perusal of Franklin's autobiography sent him to America. In 1819, being about twenty years old, he landed at Halifax and gradually worked his way down the coast as far as Charleston, S. C. He picked up any job that came in his way, from school-teaching to reporting, but after 1823 he was steadily engaged in newspaper work in New York. His life in the South had inspired him with contempt for the negro slave and with admiration for the planter aristocracy, so that he naturally enlisted in the ranks of the conservative democracy. As reporter for the New York *Enquirer* in 1827 he wrote from Washington a series of gossip letters about public men and affairs at the national capital. These letters were avowedly modelled by him upon the letters of Horace Walpole and were the first professional efforts of the kind. They were written in the interest of Andrew Jackson, and of the Regency in New York, and they were then deemed graphic and amusing pictures of Washington life. Amusing they

certainly were, for after witnessing Jackson's inauguration, Bennett wrote that "Justice, with firmer grasp, secured her scales, 'Hope, enchanted, smiled,' and the Genius of our country breathed a living defiance to the world." "What a lesson," concluded Bennett, "for the monarchies of Europe!" Republican sentiments were still glittering with the charm of novelty to this young Scotchman, and his exuberance of imagination was not simulated. It was quite native and spontaneous. The process of disillusion followed speedily and was too rapid and extended for his moral health. He became a member of the Tammany Society and he became intimately associated with Webb and Noah. Nevertheless, so steadfast was he to the name and doctrine of democracy that he cut loose from Webb and Noah when they, in 1832, under strong suspicion of venality, abruptly abjured the Jackson faith.

The *Courier and Enquirer* became the leading organ of the party which Col. Webb first called "Whig," and Bennett was thrown out of employment. Bennett expected aid from the Regency for whom he had sacrificed himself. He seems to have had no further aim as yet than to become a political journalist like his neighbors and associates, and to await the rewards of partisan service. He made two shortlived attempts to establish a party organ, and in its behalf he wrote appealing letters to Hoyt and to Van Buren asking for loans of money. Van Buren, who was just then complaining to Hoyt that his newspaper chorus was too expensive, buttoned his pocket against James Gordon Bennett, and the other Regency politicians refused to help. These keen-witted men had discerned Bennett's volatile character. He was too elusive for them. He had even made fun of Croswell and he had not been obsequious enough regarding the Democratic policy concerning the deposits. So they passed him by on the other side, and thereby assisted to revolutionize our newspaper world.

Bennett had discovered that a paper which is universally denounced will be universally read. He had perceived that a democratic revival demanded a more democratic press, and his tough Scotch fibre was elastic enough to endure either pull or pressure. Stung by what he termed Van Buren's heartlessness, he determined to make a paper which should be the master of politicians, not their tool. To that purpose, despite all his frivolities and sinuosities, he clung with the tenacity of a Scotchman and the effrontery of a Frenchman. Moreover Bennett possessed in a high degree the ability which is at once the pride and bane of two-thirds of our so-called successful journalists to-day—the ability to write crisply, interestingly, and omnisciently about everything, including the things of which he knew nothing.

Out of the cellar at No. 20 Wall Street came the first copy of the *Daily Herald*, May 6, 1835, a little four-page penny paper, with four columns to a page. At the outset Bennett went straight to his mark. In the first place, his salutatory spoke of "principles, political party principles" as "steel-traps to catch the public." "We mean," wrote Bennett, "to be perfectly understood on this point, and openly disclaim all steel-traps, all principle as it is called, all party, all politics." A little later he made a plainer statement of his real political principles: "We have never been in a minority, and we never shall be." In other words his paper had become his party, and its pecuniary success his creed. To insure the triumph of that creed it was necessary that the *Herald* should voice the dominant sentiment of the day. Instead of preaching the gospel of one party in adversity and in success alike, as party organs did and do, the *Herald* must tread in the newest footmarks of shifting majorities. It might expostulate or satirize judiciously, but it must please. Thus the *Herald* was ordinarily a powerful expositor of Hunker democracy and it enjoyed a large circulation and influence in the South, yet in the two presidential campaigns in which the Whigs were successful the *Herald* kept in the van of the shouting multitude, first for "Tippecanoe and Tyler too," and afterwards for "Old Rough and Ready" Taylor.

Such was the first effect of triumphant democracy upon the press, as estimated by the most far-sighted journalist of that era. In the second place, the cheap papers, the *Sun* and the *Herald*, rejected the cumbrous credit system altogether. This cash system was tantamount to an emancipation from creditors, subscribers, and advertisers. The old cry of "Stop my paper" lost much of its terror.

In the third place, Bennett literally fulfilled his editorial promise to "give a picture of the world." He, first, in 1835, went on Change, note-book in hand, and wrote daily descriptions and reports of the stock markets. He first seized upon the opening of steam communication with Europe to organize upon that continent a bureau of foreign correspondence. He first in 1838 adopted the practice of reporting in full the proceedings of courts of law when cases of public interest were on the docket. In the same year he first began to publish in full the speeches of prominent public men in Congress and out of it. He vied with the elder papers in the race to meet the incoming ships from Europe, but when Bennett stationed his boats off Montauk Point and ran special locomotives over the Long Island Railway or even from Boston, his dignified contemporaries retired. He first in 1839 reported the proceedings of the religious

societies at their annual meetings. The good men and women at first regarded the reporter as a veritable serpent in the garden and sought to expel and exclude him, but they soon became reconciled to his presence.

In the fourth place, Bennett's editorial comments were always in the shape of short paragraphs filled with a strange but very readable mixture of common sense and impudence. In one of the first numbers he said : "The New York and Erie Railroad is to break ground in a few days. We hope they will break nothing else." This sarcasm was prophetic enough to make a reputation for any oracle. Again, the Presbyterian denomination was covered with the dust of a ponderous doctrinal controversy between Old School and New School. Bennett put the whole altercation under his microscope with a quiet remark which scarcely concealed the size of his chuckle : "Great trouble among the Presbyterians just now. The question in dispute is whether or not a man can do anything towards saving his own soul." At another time he referred to "the holy Roman Catholic Church," adding in a parenthesis "all of us Catholics are devilish holy." In 1840 when Bishop Hughes and Governor Seward tried to get public money for Catholic schools and thereby caused the formation of the Native American party, Bennett and the *Herald* were violent opponents of the Bishop's schemes, and Bennett said that his Reverence was trying to organize his church into a political club. The public had no appetite for the long-winded essays by "Publius" and "Honestus" and "Veritas" in the stately blanket sheets, when it could feed on such crisp criticism as this.

In the fifth place, Mr. Bennett's newspaper was quite emancipated also from the accepted standards of conventionality, one might almost say of ethics. He knew better than any of his rivals the pecuniary value of wholesale advertisement and his cold-blooded manner of translating notoriety into dollars and cents shocked the chivalrous soul of James Watson Webb. According to Webb's catechism gentlemen whose statements were too sharply criticized or whose motives were impugned could discover a healing balm only in an invitation to shed blood. Bennett laughed at such conduct and laughed also at such provocations. Every attack upon him was duly chronicled in the *Herald* and made a fresh means for exalting the horn of the newspaper and for extending its circulation. Bennett was assaulted on the street and in his office by those whom he censured and lampooned. Infernal machines were sent to blow him into atoms. Bennett answered with blows of ridicule and the public laughed with him and swelled the revenues of the *Herald*.

still more. Demos would buy and read the paper if it amused him, and so Bennett played the fool as well as the omniscient vizier to his majesty, the public.

The audacious vanity and vulgarity with which he paraded his own private affairs before his readers kept the light-minded portion of the community in a guffaw and alert to know what Bennett would do next. At one time he discourses thus: "Amid all these thronging ideas hurrying across the mind, crowds of feelings fresh from the heart, and projects of the fancy stealing on the heels of each other as if by enchantment, there is one drawback, there is one sin, there is one piece of wickedness of which I am guilty, and with which my conscience is weighed down night and day; I am a bachelor." Some time later he announced his engagement in a leading article under these headlines in flaming type: "To the readers of the *Herald*—Declaration of Love—Caught at last—Going to be married—New Movement in Civilization." The first and last stanzas of the wild rhapsody that follows are these: "I am going to be married in a few days. The weather is so beautiful, times are getting so good; the prospects of political and moral reform so auspicious that I cannot resist the divine instinct of honest nature any longer. . . . I cannot stop in my career. I must fulfill that awful destiny which the Almighty Father has written against my name in the broad letters of life against the wall of heaven. . . . My ardent desire has been through life, to reach the highest order of human excellence by the shortest possible cut. Association, night and day, in sickness and in health, in war and in peace, with a woman of this highest order of excellence must produce some curious results in my heart and feelings, and these results the future will develop in due time in the columns of the *Herald*. Meantime I return my heartfelt thanks for the enthusiastic patronage of the public, both of Europe and of America. The holy estate of wedlock will only increase my desire to be still more useful. God Almighty bless you all. James Gordon Bennett."

The freedom with which the *Herald* related the annals of police courts and the particularity with which it recited scandals caused the greatest offense. The elder generation regarded Bennett as one who feared not God nor regarded man. Clergymen denounced him from the pulpit. Good men shook their heads over the prosperity of the *Herald* as an ominous sign of the times, and then read it to see what new iniquity it had been guilty of. "We can well remember," says Parton, "when people bought the *Herald* on the sly and blushed when they were caught reading it; and when the man in a country place who openly subscribed for it intended by that act dis-

tinctly to enroll himself among the ungodly." Four classes in the community denounced the *Herald*: the managers of the old papers and the politicians, for obvious reasons; the stockbrokers because of the financial articles in the *Herald*; and the clergy, because of Bennett's sensationalism and open rejection of sectarian restrictions. "We defy," wrote Bennett, "the bigots of Catholicity or of Protestantism. Like Luther, like Paul, we go on our own hook." Relying on the sentiment of these four classes, the ponderous battery of the sixpenny papers, headed by the *Courier and Enquirer*, the *Journal of Commerce* and the *Evening Post* began "the moral war" against the *Herald*. They undertook to create a public sentiment against Bennett which would kill his paper. They boycotted it, and used the utmost personal and corporate influence to banish the paper from hotels and reading-rooms and to frighten away its advertisers. Webb, for instance, wrote of the "moral leprosy and revolting blasphemy of the vile sheet of that unprincipled adventurer and vulgar, depraved wretch." Mr. Park Benjamin, who was then editing a little evening paper, the *Signal*, now quite forgotten, surpassed Webb and Noah together in the abundance of his picturesque objurgation. He managed to call Bennett an "obscene foreign vagabond, a pestilential scoundrel, ass, rogue, habitual liar, loathsome and leprous slanderer and libeller." The principal support that this "moral crusade" received in the community came from the politicians of the Van Buren machine, who were eager to punish Bennett for his bitter opposition to Van Buren's re-election. The Van Buren newspapers were the most malevolent in the use of scurrilous personalities, and one of their favorite titles, "Cross-eyed vagabond," elicited from Bennett a resort in the manner of his happiest impudence. "It is true," he wrote, "that I am thus handicapped, but my visual obliquity was caused by my earnest endeavors to watch the winding ways of Martin Van Buren."

The only really sufficient pretext for this holy war was the depraved avidity with which Bennett had seized upon bits of scandal and hurried them into print in order to attract readers, even at the risk of debauching them. But even in this wickedness the *Herald* had not been a sinner above most of the other Galilaeans, unless it were worse to peddle scandal at two cents a bucket than to sell it for six cents. But not even Bennett needed to point out the ludicrousness of men like Webb and Noah in the garb of moral censors and guardians of virtue. There was a revulsion of sentiment in favor of the paper which seemed to have no friends.

Three well-known politicians and merchants called one morning upon Mr. E. K. Collins, afterwards the owner of the famous Collins

line of steamers, and, adverting to the bad character of the *Herald*, began to allude to Mr. Collins's advertisements in that paper. "Yes, yes," replied Mr. Collins, in his quick, decided tone, "yes, yes, I understand. Charles," calling to a clerk in another room, "how many advertisements have we in the *Herald* this morning?" "Three, sir," answered the polite Charles. "Three, yes, yes. Well, Charles, put in three more to-morrow morning." Then, turning to the committee, he said: "That is my answer, gentlemen, good morning."

Amid all the clamor Bennett as usual kept his temper, and replied only with jocose sallies. He generally referred to his opponents as "The Holy Alliance," and gravely thanked them for giving him so much valuable advertisement. He was obliged to enlarge the *Herald*, and its circulation considerably exceeded that of all his enemies combined. The complete pecuniary success of both the *Herald* and the *Sun* proved to be an impregnable defense. The Holy Alliance gradually disbanded and a host of imitators of both the *Sun* and the *Herald* sprang up in New York and in other cities. Most of them met an early death, but a few repeated the history of their models, as the *Herald* in Boston, the *Ledger* and the *Sun* in Philadelphia, and the *Sun* in Baltimore. In connection with the *Ledger* and the *Baltimore Sun*, the *New York Herald* established the famous pony express from Mobile to Montgomery during the Mexican War, by which all the details of that war appeared in those journals before they were received by the authorities at Washington. This exploit destroyed all that was left of the Holy Alliance, and its principal members were glad to join in 1849 to 1851 with the *Herald* in the combination for newsgathering which is now known as the New York Associated Press. That was Bennett's triumph. The institution of the Press submitted then and there to the rule of Publicity and in her service acquired that irresponsible power which we can now neither restrain nor endure.

The old fashioned party-organs accommodated themselves to the new gospel with varying fidelity and with varying success. The *Courier and Enquirer* lingered along in a semi-comatose state until 1861, when it was buried in that mausoleum of dead newspapers, the *New York World*. The *Journal of Commerce*, last of the blanket sheets, pursued the even tenor of its way among the counting-rooms, almost unnoticed by the large world, until its non-resistant ultra-Democratic doctrines in 1861 brought it some unprofitable notoriety. This was a strange fate for a paper which thirty years before, under the same proprietors, had been regarded as an Abolition sheet.

Independent journalism, as represented first by the *Sun* and *Herald*, had won a complete victory over old-fashioned partisan journalism. The time had forever departed when an Albany Regency could tune the press of the state as easily and simply as Queen Elizabeth used to tune the English pulpits. The partisan editor could no longer expect to rule as absolutely over the political opinions of his readers as the priest had once ruled over men's religious opinions. As James Parton phrased it, "An editorial is only a man speaking to men; but the news is Providence speaking to men." For good or for ill, the victory of Bennett's *Herald* came to mean this exaltation of fact over opinion; it meant the recognition of journalism as a profession, as a profession with an end and aim in itself alone, utterly separate from merely political or religious purposes. That victory of Bennett's *Herald* helped to introduce into the world an ideal of devotion to journalism, *i.e.*, to truth-telling for its own sake, to which neither Bennett nor his paper could ever lay serious claim.

Bennett was often little better than a mountebank; his channel of truth discharged its contents without discrimination, sometimes clear water and sometimes the filth of a sewer. The stream cannot rise higher than its source; and no newspaper can be better than its dominant mind. We may regret that the cultured Bryant did not assume the prerogative of holding the mirror up to nature, did not transform the *Evening Post* into a keyboard across whose surface ran all the wires of human thought and passion. But the stubborn fact remains that the unmoral Bennett had this capacity for successful enterprise and had shaken off every ambition but the journalistic one. The virtuous Bryant had neither the capacity for such enterprise nor the freedom from distracting bondage to two or even more masters.

CHARLES H. LEVERMORE.

## SHERMAN'S MARCH TO THE SEA

In October, 1864, soon after he had evacuated Atlanta, Hood began a movement on Sherman's communications and broke up the railroad in his rear. He marched west and reached Gadsden, Alabama, October 20. He shunned a battle with Sherman, who was eager to bring one on, but Hood did not trust his troops, so impaired were their fighting qualities. In getting into the rear of the Union army he had made an adroit and audacious movement causing irritation to Sherman and anxiety to the authorities in Washington which was increased by his eluding the pursuit of the Federal commander. Leaving one corps in Atlanta Sherman began his march northward with the rest of the army October 4; on the twentieth he was at Gaylesville, Alabama. "The month of October closed to us looking decidedly squally," writes Sherman. He had already sent Thomas to Nashville to protect Tennessee while he studied and reflected how he might checkmate Hood. He decided on a march through Georgia to the sea and endeavored to obtain Grant's consent to this plan.

October 30, Hood began to cross the Tennessee river with the intention of invading Tennessee. This caused Grant apprehension, which was allayed by the reasoning of Sherman, and finally Grant sent him a despatch saying "Go as you propose."

The march to the sea, the advance northward from Savannah, and the operations of Thomas in Tennessee, are a combination of bold and effective strategy, only possible after the Chattanooga-Atlanta campaign and a fit sequel to it. A hundred persons may have conceived the design of marching to the ocean but the genius of the general lay in foreseeing the possible moves of his adversary, in guarding against them and in his estimate of the physical and moral result of cutting the Confederacy in twain. Not under-rating the venture, wise in precaution, Sherman showed the same boldness and tenacity as Grant in his Vicksburg campaign in sticking to his purpose when others shook their heads. No general, who lacked qualities of daring and resolution, would have persisted in his determination to advance through Georgia after Hood had crossed the Tennessee river, especially when Grant for a time doubted the wisdom of the movement. As he was the commander,

knew his men and comprehended the conditions, he could lay no claim to success unless Thomas should defeat Hood. Therein, as the affair turned out, lay the risk. Sherman knew Thomas through and through. Classmates at West Point they had ever since been friends, and this friendship was cemented during the vicissitudes of the Civil War despite their differences of opinion proceeding from their diverse temperaments. Sherman had implicit confidence in Thomas, thought that he had furnished him a force sufficient for all emergencies and that the defense of Tennessee was not left to chance. "If I had Schofield," Thomas wrote Halleck, November 1, "I should feel perfectly safe." Sherman detached Schofield's corps from his army and sent it northward with instructions to report to Thomas for orders. On the day that Sherman started for the sea Thomas telegraphed to him: "I have no fear that Beauregard [Hood] can do us any harm now, and if he attempts to follow you, I will follow him as far as possible. If he does not follow you I will then thoroughly organize my troops and I believe I shall have men enough to ruin him unless he gets out of the way very rapidly." The opinion of the able and experienced critics, Mr. Ropes and General Schofield, who maintain that Sherman should have given Thomas more men, are refuted by the statements of Sherman and Thomas themselves. Nor must it be forgotten that the Union commanders were at this time uncertain whether Hood would follow Sherman or move north toward Nashville. The conferences between Beauregard, the commander of the Department, and Hood, and Davis's despatch to Hood, which have since been disclosed, attest the wisdom of anticipation and the preparedness for contingencies on the Union side. While Hood before the end of October had won Beauregard's consent to his plan of invading Tennessee, Jefferson Davis was not of the same mind. His telegram of November 7 (which however was not received by Hood until the twelfth) lacks a degree of positiveness and is interpreted differently but there is little doubt that he meant to disapprove an advance into Tennessee before Sherman had been defeated. As events happened the army that marched to the sea was unnecessarily large and 10,000 more men with Schofield might have saved some trial of soul. Nevertheless, as things looked at the time, Sherman must be sufficiently strong to defeat Hood and the scattered forces of uncertain number which would gather to protect Georgia. Moreover, as his ultimate purpose was to "re-enforce our armies in Virginia," he must have troops enough to cope with Lee until Grant should be at his heels. He reckoned that the force left in Tennessee was "numerically greater" than Hood's.

Considering everything that could have been known between November 1 and 12 it seems clear beyond dispute that he made a fair division of his army between himself and Thomas.

Deliberation, care and foresight marked the thoughts of Sherman as he reviewed his decision ; up to within six days of his start southward he held himself ready in a certain contingency to co-operate with Thomas in the pursuit of Hood, the one moving directly against the Confederates and the other endeavoring to cut off their retreat, for it was ever clear to his mind that "the first object should be the destruction of that army," but as the days wore on the advantages of the march to the sea outweighed those of any other plan and the irrevocable step was taken. Stopping at Cartersville, November 12, on his progress southward he received Thomas's last despatch, acknowledged it and replied "all right ;" a bridge was burned severing the telegraph wire and all communication with Thomas and his government. Like Julian who "plunged into the recesses of the Marcian or Black forest," the fate of Sherman was for many days "unknown to the world." No direct intelligence from him reached the North from November 12 to December 14. "I will not attempt to send couriers back," he had written to Grant, "but trust to the Richmond papers to keep you well advised." For these thirty-two days Lincoln and Grant had no other information of this important movement than what they gleaned from the Southern journals.

Sherman's imagination was impressed vividly with the strangeness of the situation : "two hostile armies were marching in opposite directions, each in the full belief that it was achieving a final and conclusive result in a great war." It would be impossible to show an entire consistency in the utterances of this great general ; at times one aspect of the campaign appeared to him to the exclusion of another, and as he was given to fertile thought and fluent expression the idea uppermost in his mind was apt to come out. As with almost all men of action, the speculation of to-day might differ from that of yesterday and vary again to-morrow, yet this did not impair a capacity to make a correct decision nor steadfastness in the execution of a plan. Grant, more reticent and not expansive, is not chargeable in the same degree with inconsistency in his written words. He lacked imagination and was not given to worry. When any comparison is made between the two, the remark attributed to Sherman is pat as indicating the different manner in which they seem to look a situation in the face. "Grant does not care for what he cannot see the enemy doing and it scares me."

While the army was concentrating at Atlanta, the railway station, machine-shops, and other buildings of that city useful to the enemy in its military operations were destroyed. The right wing and one corps of the left wing having started the day before, Sherman rode out of Atlanta November 16 with the Fourteenth Corps; he had in all 62,000 "able-bodied, experienced soldiers, well armed, well equipped and provided, as far as human foresight could, with all the essentials of life, strength and vigorous action." One of the bands happening to play "John Brown's body lies a-mouldering in the grave," the men sang the well-known song, giving to the chorus "Glory, glory hallelujah, his soul is marching on," a force and spirit full of meaning as their minds reverted to the events which had taken place since that December day in 1859 when he, who was now a saint in their calendar, had suffered death on the scaffold. When the march to the sea began, the weather was fine, the air bracing and the movement to the south and east exhilarated the men. Many of the common soldiers called out to their general, "Uncle Billy, I guess Grant is waiting for us at Richmond." "There was a 'devil-may-care' feeling pervading officers and men," relates Sherman, "that made me feel the full load of responsibility." The tale of the march is not one of battle and inch-by-inch progress as was the campaign from Chattanooga to Atlanta. "As to the 'lion' in our path," wrote Sherman after he had reached Savannah, "we never met him." "In all our marching through Georgia Hardee [the Confederate commander] has not forced me to use anything but a skirmish line." Officers and men looked upon the march as a "picnic," "a vast holiday frolic." The burden was on the general in command. He was in the enemy's country; he must keep this large army supplied. Two critics, Mr. Ropes and Colonel Henry Stone, who have not a high opinion of Sherman's tactics on the battlefield, testify to his skill in handling an army on the march and to his foresight and care in providing it with food and munitions of war. When the army set out it had approximately supplies of bread for twenty days, sugar, coffee, and salt for forty and about three days' forage in grain; it had also a sufficient quantity of ammunition; all this was carried in 2500 wagons with a team of six mules to each. Drovers of cattle, enough to insure fresh meat for more than a month, were part of the commissariat. The ambulances were 600 in number; the artillery had been reduced to 65 guns. Pontoon trains were carried along as the invading host had many rivers to cross. The right wing was composed of the Fifteenth and Seventeenth Corps, the left wing of the Fourteenth and Twentieth; each corps marched on a separate road. The

division of the wagon trains gave each corps about 800 wagons, which occupied on the march five miles or more of road. The artillery and wagons with their advance and rear guards had the right of way, the men taking improvised paths at their side. The troops began their daily march at dawn and pitched their camp soon after noon, having covered ordinarily ten to fifteen miles. Milledgeville, the capital of the state, was reached by the left wing in seven days. This march through the heart of Georgia alarmed the Confederates lest either Macon or Augusta or both might be attacked, with the result that they divided their forces; and when it became clear that Savannah was the place on the sea aimed at it was impossible for various reasons to concentrate a large number of troops for defense. By December 10 the enemy was driven within his lines at Savannah; the march of 360 miles was over; the siege began.

In the special field order of November 9 it was said, "The army will forage liberally on the country during the march." As the state was sparsely settled and the plan of making requisitions on the civil authorities therefore impracticable, this was the only possible mode of supplying the troops. The arrangements for the foraging were made and carried out with military precision. Each brigade sent out a party of about fifty men on foot who would return mounted, driving cattle and mules and hauling wagons or family carriages loaded with fresh mutton, smoked bacon, turkeys, chickens, ducks, corn meal, jugs of molasses and sweet potatoes. The crop having been large, just gathered and laid by for the winter, the section never before having been visited by a hostile army, the land was rich in provisions and forage. While Sherman was maturing the plan of his march to the sea, he wrote to Halleck: "The people of Georgia don't know what war means but when the rich planters of the Oconee and Savannah see their fences and corn and hogs and sheep vanish before their eyes they will have something more than a mean opinion of the 'Yanks.' Even now our poor mules laugh at the fine cornfields and our soldiers riot on chestnuts, sweet potatoes, pigs and chicken." While Sherman and his officers labored sincerely to have the foraging done in an orderly way the men often took food on their own account in a riotous manner. The general himself relates this incident occurring on the march between Atlanta and Milledgeville: "A soldier passed me with a ham on his musket, a jug of sorghum-molasses under his arm and a big piece of honey in his hand, from which he was eating, and, catching my eye he remarked *sotto voce* and carelessly to a comrade, 'Forage liberally on the country,' quoting from my general orders." Sher-

man reproved the man as he did others when similar acts of lawlessness fell under his observation, explaining that "foraging must be limited to the regular parties properly detailed." Full of pride in his soldiers and elated at their manifestations of confidence in him, he gave when the march was completed this mild report of their infractions of discipline: "A little loose in foraging, 'they did some things they ought not to have done.'" A spirit of fun pervaded the army which exhibited itself in innocent frolics, the most typical of which was the meeting of some of the officers in the Hall of Representatives at Milledgeville where they constituted themselves the Legislature of the State of Georgia, elected a speaker, and after a formal debate repealed by a fair vote the Ordinance of Secession.

Destruction was a part of the business of the march. Lee's army drew its supplies of provisions largely from Georgia. "The State of Georgia alone," said Jefferson Davis in his speech at Augusta, "produces food enough not only for her own people and the army within it, but feeds too the Army of Virginia." It became of the utmost importance to sever the railroad communication between the Gulf States and Richmond and to this Sherman gave his personal attention. The bridges and trestles were burned, the masonry of the culverts was blown up. In the destruction of the iron rails mechanical skill vied with native ingenuity in doing the most effective work. The chief engineer designed a machine for twisting the rails after heating them in the fires made by burning the ties: this was used by the Michigan and Missouri engineers. But the infantry, with the mania for destruction which pervaded the army, joined in the work, carrying the rails, when they came to a red heat in the bonfires of the ties, to the nearest trees and twisting them about the trunks or warping them in some fantastic way so that they were useless except for old iron and the old iron even was in unmanageable shape for working in a mill. About 265 miles of railroad were thus destroyed. This in the heart of Jeff Davis's empire, as Sherman called it, was an almost irreparable damage owing to the lack of factories which could make rails for renewals and to the embargo on imports by the blockade of the Southern ports. Stations and machine-shops along the lines were burned. Many thousand bales of cotton, a large number of cotton-gins and presses were destroyed. At Milledgeville Sherman reports: "I burned the railroad buildings and the arsenal; the State House and Governor's mansion I left unharmed." The penitentiary had been burned by the convicts before the arrival of the army. At Millen the soldiers by orders applied the torch to

"the very handsome depot, railroad hotel and three or four large storehouses." A negro from whom Sherman asked information regarding the operations of the right wing, thus described what he had seen: "First there come along some cavalrymen and they burned the depot; then come along some infantry men and they tore up the track and burned it; and just before I left they set fire to the well." It was the policy of the general to forbear destroying private property, but in one important case he deviated from the rule. Stopping for the night at a plantation he discovered to belong to Howell Cobb, Buchanan's Secretary of the Treasury, he sent back word to the corps commander, "spare nothing." In nearly all of his despatches after he reached the sea he gloated over the destruction of property, giving in the one to Halleck the most emphatic statement of the damage which had been done. "We have consumed the corn and fodder in the region of country thirty miles on either side of a line from Atlanta to Savannah as also the sweet potatoes, cattle, hogs, sheep and poultry, and have carried away more than 10,000 horses and mules as well as a countless number of their slaves. I estimate the damage done to the State of Georgia and its military resources at \$100,000,000; at least \$20,000,000 of which has inured to our advantage and the remainder is simple waste and destruction. This may seem a hard species of warfare but it brings the sad realities of war home to those who have been directly or indirectly instrumental in involving us in its attendant calamities." Well might he say afterwards, "War is hell."

Various orders given from time to time show that there was not only lawless foraging but that there was an unwarranted burning of buildings. A more serious charge against the men of this Western army is pillage. Sherman admits the truth of it and so does General Cox. Since the end of the campaign Sherman had heard of jewelry being taken from women and is of the opinion that these depredations were committed by parties of foragers usually called "bummers." Cox dubs with that name the confirmed and habitual stragglers to whom he ascribes a large part of the irregular acts. Some of the pilfering was undoubtedly due to the uncontrollable American desire for mementos of places visited which were connected with great events. Moreover while three and one half years of civil war had built up an effective fighting machine, they had caused a relaxation in the rules of right conduct among its members so that it had come to be considered proper to despoil anyone living in the enemy's country; but there was a sincere desire on the part of the commander and his officers to restrain the soldiers

within the limits of civilized usage. The lofty personal character of most of the men in high command and the severity of the punishment threatened for breaches of discipline are evidence of this; and at least one soldier for a petty theft was sentenced "to be shot to death by musketry." Nor must it be overlooked that there was considerable plundering by bands of Confederates which people were prone to charge against Sherman's men. From the characterization of the Union officers one notable exception must be made. Kilpatrick, the commander of the cavalry, was notorious for his immorality and rapacity, and his escapades, winked at by Sherman on account of his military efficiency, were demoralizing to the army at the time and have since tended to give it a bad name. While extenuating nothing it is a gratification to record some words of Sherman which must be read in the light of his honesty of soul and truthfulness of statement. "I never heard," he wrote, "of any cases of murder or rape."

Sherman's campaign struck a blow at slavery. Everywhere the negroes received the Northern soldiers with joy. Near Covington an old gray-haired negro said to Sherman that he "had been looking for the angel of the Lord ever since he was knee-high" and he supposed that the success of the Northern army would bring him freedom. Another who was spokesman for a large number of fellow slaves said to an aide-de-camp of the General: "Ise hope de Lord will prosper you Yankees and Mr. Sherman, because I tinks and we all tinks dat you'se down here in our interests." At Milledgeville the negroes in their ecstacy shouted "Bress de Lord! tanks be to Almighty God, the Yanks is come! de day ob jubilee hab arribed!" Negro men, women and children joined the column at every mile of our march," reported General Slocum who commanded the left wing. "I think at least 14,000 of these people joined the two columns at different points on the march, but many of them were too old and infirm and others too young to endure the fatigues of the march and were therefore left in the rear. More than one half of the above number however reached the coast with us." The desire to realize their freedom at once was keen, and the number would have been far greater had not Sherman discouraged the negroes from following the army, as all but the young and able-bodied who were put to use were a serious drawback from increasing the number of mouths to be fed, and from the constant apprehension lest they might hamper the movements of the troops in the event that the enemy in formidable array was encountered. But the tidings that President Lincoln had proclaimed them all free was spread far and wide.

Hardee found his position in Savannah untenable and on the night of December 20 evacuated it. Sherman took posession of the city and sent his celebrated dispatch to President Lincoln, who received it opportunely on the evening of Christmas day. "I beg to present to you," the general said, "as a Christmas gift the city of Savannah with 150 heavy guns and plenty of ammunition and also about 25,000 bales of cotton."

JAMES FORD RHODES.

## FRENCH EXPERIENCE WITH REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT IN THE WEST INDIES<sup>1</sup>

THE problem of representative government in tropical colonies is beset with extraordinary difficulties, which are crying for solution just at present, when so many important colonial establishments have been founded in those regions. The simplest method of solving the question, that of entrusting the administration to the discretion of tried officials, as is done in the English crown colonies, does not satisfy the political aspirations of the residents in the colonies and also runs counter to the ideal of government by consent, and of the political and moral amelioration of the natives. In case a representative council is established, in order to give opportunity for the expression of the political will of the inhabitants, it may be based either upon a restricted election or upon manhood suffrage. The latter solution has been tried only in the French tropical colonies. There the councils-general have been given real legislative power and are not merely advisory as in the English crown colonies. Moreover, the governor, while not legally responsible to the council, is nevertheless forced ultimately to yield to its will, on account of its power to refuse certain important appropriations.

The French West Indies are the best imaginable field for political assimilation; the conditions which may be regarded as rendering that policy difficult or impossible are absent in the Antilles. There are two such contingencies: either, the population is so abjectly barbarous or decadent that even the rudimentary facts of a higher civilization cannot be understood by it; or it has a long-established social order, and its traditional religion, customs and political institutions lead it to resist assimilation to an alien society, as is the case in countries like Siam, Burma, and Cambodia. Neither contingency applies to the West Indies.

The black and colored population of Martinique, originally recruited from various parts of Africa, has through the long era of slavery lost most of the connection with its older life. When the patriarchal organization of slavery was abolished in 1848, it became to a certain extent an atomistic society upon which assimilation could work with full force. Moreover, the colored population is

<sup>1</sup> Paper read before the American Historical Association, December 28, 1900.

itself desirous of becoming more and more like the former masters. The negroes of the French Antilles are in a distinctly favorable position, being in full possession and enjoyment of all the political rights of French citizens. They are not *de facto* disfranchised as in the United States, nor have they relapsed into savagery as have the blacks in the interior of Hayti. The French islands are therefore perhaps the best field for a study of the political capacity and the social tendencies of a colored population which is allowed to govern itself after republican models.

The importance of the political history of these islands becomes still greater when we consider that they have been practically the model for French colonial organization and legislation up to the present. All French dependencies were looked upon as colonies, and the theories which in the enthusiasm of the Revolution had been applied to the small French colonies of that time were extended to the large possessions acquired after 1870. The Antilles and Guiana are the last remnant of a vast empire in America and as such have always been treated with much liberality and favor. Moreover, the representatives of these colonies at Paris were, on account of their familiarity with colonial affairs, looked upon as authorities in all colonial questions, and they took every opportunity to advocate the policy of representative government and political assimilation to which they owed their own importance.

Thus these islands have had an influence upon French history out of all proportion to their size; while in themselves they illustrate all the problems of a modern dynamic society,—the questions of the use of political power, of public education and religion, the distribution of property, and socialism. To these are superadded the intensely interesting problems that always attend the meeting of races on different planes of civilization. The very smallness of the islands makes them specially valuable to the student; like the Athens of Plato and Aristotle, Martinique is a miniature world in which almost all social problems can be studied in a simple form. The student will derive both assistance and pleasure from the insular self-importance and naïveté of the inhabitants.

It will be necessary briefly to review the history of these colonies before 1870, in order that we may understand the bases of the present institutions. Though slavery was abolished in 1848, the whites remained in power politically for some time and also retained the control of labor, which is a question of life and death to industry in tropical colonies. A decree<sup>1</sup> of February 13, 1852, imposed on agricultural laborers the obligation of having a contract

<sup>1</sup>Cited in Huc, *Martinique*, Paris, 1877.

of engagement for one year, or of carrying a *livret*, in default of which they could be punished as vagabonds. Strict penalties were also imposed for missing the daily work. But this measure was too rigid; it defeated its own purpose, in that it caused laborers to strive to become small proprietors and thus to escape from its operation. To supply the necessary labor the system of Hindu immigration was next resorted to. Beginning in 1853 regular importations were made, and by 1870 sixteen thousand Hindu coolies had been introduced into Martinique. A strong fiscal institution, *La Société de Crédit Foncier Colonial*, was created in 1863, for the purpose of assisting the landholders under the new economic conditions.<sup>1</sup> By these means the proprietors of plantations sought to weather the dangers into which the abolition of slavery had brought them.

The political institutions of the French West Indies are the result of two opposite policies,—the Republican policy of absolute centralized assimilation, and the policy of a colonial régime with special laws and privileged local legislatures or general councils, inaugurated by the July monarchy and taken up again under the Second Empire. It was the policy of the three successive Republics to regard the colonies as integral parts of the national territory, to assimilate their administration to that of a French department, and to allow the colonial population a voice in the national parliament. On the contrary, the Monarchy, as well as the Empire, looked upon the colonies as *pays d'exception*, to be governed by special laws and decrees, hence not entitled to participation in the national legislature; they however favored the policy of giving considerable powers, mostly of an administrative nature, to the colonial councils. The products of these two policies constitute the political institutions of the French West Indies since 1870; they have never been harmonized, nor has the one been definitely abandoned for the other; so these colonies enjoy both representation in the national parliament, and the possession of local councils with a great latitude of functions. In reviewing briefly the history of these institutions we shall recognize their somewhat haphazard origin as well as the grave practical difficulties which are due to the lack of subsequent harmonization.

Before the Revolution, the old French colonies, Martinique, Guadeloupe, Guiana, and Réunion were administered, much as are the present English crown colonies, by a governor, with the assistance of an executive council and a colonial assembly summoned at irregular intervals. By royal decree of 1787 the organization of this assembly was regulated and the qualification for suffrage was

<sup>1</sup> *Annuaire de la Martinique*, 1900, p. 208.

fixed as the ownership of at least twelve slaves. With the Revolution came representation in the national assemblies; the creole French were at that time especially popular and influential in French society; so their request for representation was readily accorded. Seventeen *cahiers* supported this demand; that of the *Tiers État* of Versailles even went so far as to propose complete assimilation of the colonies.<sup>1</sup> The idea of colonial representation in parliament is nowhere directly suggested by the French pre-Revolutionary publicists, although it is completely in accord with their general system. It remained for the practical American, Benjamin Franklin, and for Adam Smith, to propose in its concrete form this extreme measure of "Latin assimilation." Its adoption by the French nation at this time was undoubtedly due to the influence and enterprise of the creoles residing in France, who relied on the traditional policy first announced by Louis XIII. in his edict of 1642 "que les descendants des Français habitués ès dites îles seront réputés naturels français, capable de toutes charges et honneurs."

By the constitution of 1795, the colonies were absolutely assimilated to the French national territory<sup>2</sup> and treated as departments. Before these provisions could produce any practical results they were abrogated by the Consular Constitution of 1799, which deprived the colonies of national representation and placed them again under a régime of special law. Not until the end of the Monarchy of the Restoration, however, was colonial administration definitely organized. By the ordinance of February 9, 1827, there was established in each colony an appointive general council with purely advisory powers. Under the July Monarchy, by the *Charte Coloniale* of April 24, 1833, this council was made elective, with a very high qualification for suffrage (30,000 fr. movable property, or the annual payment of 300 fr. direct taxes). This local assembly sent two delegates to Paris to act as intermediaries between the colony and the ministry. As the colonies had no deputies or senators, the Council retained the services of members of the Chamber and the Senate, who in return for a handsome fee defended the colonial interests within the national parliament.

The Revolutionary government of 1848 returned to the policy of absolute assimilation; it abrogated the system of special laws and discontinued the general councils; as a compensation the colonies received the right of representation in the national parliament, under a system of manhood suffrage in which the newly emancipated negroes were included.

<sup>1</sup> *Archives Parl.*, V. 220.

<sup>2</sup> Art. 6. "Les Colonies françaises sont parties intégrantes de la République, et sont soumises à la même loi constitutionnelle."

In 1852 the system of special legislation was again restored on the ground that the interests and needs of the colonies differed essentially from those of the mother country, and that the hand of authority and the soothing influence of time were necessary to harmonize the social elements distracted by a radical revolution. It was stated that it was not so much the purpose of the government to discard the colonial element in metropolitan legislation, as to free the situation in the colonies from the agitation of political elections.<sup>1</sup> The right of representation in the national parliament was accordingly annulled.<sup>2</sup> The Senate, which had been given the power of organic legislation by the constitution of 1852, decreed by the *Sénatus-consulte* of 1854 (May 3) that there should be in the colonies appointive general councils with functions analogous to those of the French departmental assemblies. This measure laid the foundation of the present system of colonial councils. The function of ordinary legislation for the colonies was by the Senate delegated to the executive power, to be exercised by means of administrative decrees, or by orders in council of state. This arrangement is known as the *système des décrets*.

By the very important *Sénatus-consulte* of 1866 (July 4) the powers of the colonial councils were substantially augmented, and they acquired distinctive attributes not possessed by the departmental assemblies. Thus they received the power to legislate on all matters concerning the management of public property, acquisition thereof by the colony, and grants made out of it; on public works and concessions for their execution; on the system of roads; and finally, most important of all, they were given the right to vote all taxes and contributions, to fix the customs tariff and the tariff of the *octroi de mer*.<sup>3</sup> The councils remained appointive, one half of their number being named by the governor, the other half by the municipal councils, which were themselves appointed by the head executive. The above attributes of legislation, together with extensive powers of deliberation and advice on matters of the budget and colonial administration, gave the councils great influence. Still they were rather an administrative council than a legislature and had no share in the ordinary civil or criminal legislation, as the French codes were in force in the colonies. The governments immediately following the Revolution of 1870 did not change these functions of the general councils, but, as the principle of election by manhood suffrage was introduced, they soon became almost

<sup>1</sup> *Exposé des Motifs, Procès-verbaux, Sénat, 1852*, I. 447 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Décret Organique du 2 février, 1852*.

<sup>3</sup> The *pacte colonial*, or system of navigation laws, had been abolished in 1861.

independent of central control. The powers originally granted to an appointive council were left unaltered when that body became an elective assembly. Nor was the national executive deprived of the authority of legislating for the colonies by decree or order in council; this *système des décrets* has become a special grievance of the colonies, since that time.<sup>1</sup> In 1871 colonial representation in the national parliament was re-established, the deputies being elected by universal suffrage.

The system as it has existed since 1870 may therefore be briefly described as follows. The colonies participate in national legislation through the presence of their representatives in the Senate and Chamber of Deputies. General colonial legislation, however, is settled almost entirely by the national executive, and colonial matters come up in the parliament only by way of interpellation or when the budget is being discussed. The local colonial assemblies originate much of the administrative legislation, either by the exercise of their powers enumerated above, or by deliberating upon measures which are given final force of law by *arrêté* of the governor or decree of the head of the state. The civil service in the colonies is recruited chiefly by appointment through the governor; but as he is himself dependent upon the majority in a general council, the latter body exercises great influence in the selection of public officials. It is the operation and the effects of this system in the years from 1870 to 1900 that we desire to investigate in an inquiry which may perhaps throw some light on the character of political life in tropical colonies among a colored population. The value of institutions like colonial representation in the national parliament and elective local assemblies or councils is very much disputed, and but little is known about the exact influence of these institutions upon political activity and party life both in the colonies and in the mother country. Other interesting questions that will claim our attention are the merits and defects of the "system of decrees," the extension of the national constitution to colonial possessions, and the relations of colonial politics to religion, education and socialism. While not neglecting the political experience of Guadeloupe, as well as of French Guiana, we will take Martinique as the typical example of a French tropical colony.

The political history of Martinique since 1870 may be divided into three periods. During the first decade the whites were still practically in control. The end of this period saw the organization of the mulatto government which resulted in the almost complete withdrawal of the whites from politics. While no clearly marked party

<sup>1</sup> It is the subject of Senator Isaac's book, *Constitution et Sénatus-Consultes*.

divisions existed in the second decade, the third and final period brought the growth of two factions among the governing class, who assumed the name and methods of political parties.

No immediate revolution followed upon the establishment of manhood suffrage. The administration in the island remained in the hands of a line of admirals, who, as governors, were bound by the traditions of the former régime. In the executive departments, even as late as 1879 the list of higher officials comprised very few colored men. Thus in the department of justice there were thirty-six whites to six colored men,<sup>1</sup> while in that of the interior the numbers were fourteen to four. In the colonial council the whites only gradually gave way to the increasing number of colored deputies. In 1875 there were still eleven white members out of a total of twenty-four; while in Guadeloupe they retained the majority, and in Réunion they held the whole council.<sup>2</sup> Thus it was possible to maintain institutions favorable to the great industries, such as the importation of coolie labor; a bounty was even voted to cultivators of coffee. Moreover, although both in 1871 and in 1874 an appropriation of one hundred thousand francs was set aside for the purpose of founding a lay *lycée*, the educational monopoly of the Church remained practically intact. Representatives of the latter expressed themselves in unmincing terms upon the tendency towards purely secular instruction: "L'Église n'acceptera jamais ce programme; elle luttera jusqu'au bout pour défendre ses droits, car, en se rappelant qu'elle seule a été chargée de sauver les âmes, elle se rappellera en même temps qu'à elle seule il a été dit: Allez et enseignez. L'éducation doit être religieuse, elle doit être chrétienne ou elle ne sera pas."<sup>3</sup>

Expressions like these are the signs of the coming storm. Such signs were not wanting, especially on the part of the whites, who were violent in their opposition to the growing political ambitions of the colored population. In 1877 the governor, Admiral Kergrist, was recalled by the home government which was then in the hands of the "men of the sixteenth of May," because of his liberal tendencies.<sup>4</sup> His successor, Admiral Grasset, soon came in collision with the general council. He had established a chamber of agriculture composed of the leading landed proprietors of the island.<sup>5</sup> The council looked upon this as a political movement favoring the white class and refused to vote the credit demanded.

<sup>1</sup> *Annuaire de la Martinique*, 1879.

<sup>2</sup> Schoelcher, *Polémique Coloniale*, I. 11.

<sup>3</sup> *Le Bien Public, Bulletin Religieux de la Martinique*, June 24, 1876.

<sup>4</sup> Schoelcher, *Polémique Coloniale*, Paris, 1882, I. 144.

<sup>5</sup> Schoelcher, *Polémique Coloniale*, I. 148.

The struggle thus begun came to a head during the administration of Admiral Aube, in the years from 1879 to 1881. The council-general had become restive under the control of the naval governors. It felt its strength as a representative body and had discovered what power it could exercise by means of refusing money grants. By law of the state, ever since the organization of the general councils, the colonial expenses are divided into obligatory and facultative, the latter being fixed by the local assemblies; as some important services are on the facultative list, the council is enabled to exercise great influence by a suppression of items in the budget. The home government defined its position through a letter<sup>1</sup> written by the Minister of the Marine and Colonies, Admiral Jauréguiberry, to Governor Aube on December 20, 1879. There the minister maintains that the council has no right to vote the suppression of employments or to diminish a credit for the salary of designated persons or for services organized by the ministry of the marine. Positions in these services are to be considered as guaranteed by a regular investiture. The general council refused to take this view of the case. It interpreted the word facultative liberally and held that, if it found a service superfluous or too expensive, it had full power to reduce the credit therefor, regardless of the position of individual incumbents.

In general matters of administration, the council showed itself unfavorable to the policy of internal improvements upheld by the governor. By imposing too strict a time-limit for a survey they defeated a railway project favored by him. They reduced the credits for the following services: roads and bridges, customs, registration, veterinary aid and dry dock. The latter was the subject of particular discussion between the governor and council. On October 26, 1880, the Minister of the Marine wrote to the governor calling his attention to the necessity of liberal credits for keeping up the dock, and deprecating the policy of retrenchment favored by the local assembly.<sup>2</sup> Notwithstanding this appeal the council voted a reduction of fifteen thousand francs. Another matter of controversy was the protection of the imported Hindu laborers. Under the date of July 14, 1880, the British consul had addressed to the governor a long complaint concerning the inefficiency of the immigration service. He stated that his remonstrances had constantly met the objection that the general council had not voted the necessary funds for the protection of the immigrants and he threatened a withdrawal

<sup>1</sup> Cited in Aube, *La Martinique*, Paris, 1882, p. 99. This book is an account of Aube's administration, with documentary evidences.

<sup>2</sup> Letter cited in Aube, *La Martinique*, p. 24.

of the treaty of 1862, by which the importation of labor was regulated.<sup>1</sup> Notwithstanding this remonstrance the general council voted the suppression of the special inspection service and re-established a system condemned by experience, under which town syndics performed the inspection and supervision. The council at this time also discontinued the bounty which had before been allowed to cultivators of coffee.

Governor Aube, supported by a unanimous privy council, refused to execute the resolutions of the assembly, which seemed to him contrary to the policy of the government as announced in the letter of December 20, 1879. But when Admiral Cloué in 1880 displaced Admiral Jauréguiberry in the Ministry of the Marine, Governor Aube lost the support of the home government in the course he had followed and was ordered to enforce the decisions taken by the general council.<sup>2</sup> Thus the powers of this assembly received confirmation from the highest quarters; small wonder that it accepted this action as an admission that it would be impossible to govern the colonies peaceably without its consent, and that it would henceforth have the virtual management of the civil service. At the same time a French civilian, M. Allègre, became governor, and the policy of having admirals in that position was definitely abandoned.<sup>3</sup>

By a law of July 27, 1880, the criminal jury was introduced into the French Antilles; the law of June 30, 1881, guaranteed the liberty of public meetings; and that of July 29 of the same year, extended the liberty of the press to the colonies. In its political and civil rights the colored population was thus completely assimilated to the mother country and, moreover, the colonial general councils had far greater powers than the provincial assemblies in France. Assimilation was the watchword of the day. On December 7, 1882, the council of Martinique, by a unanimous vote, passed the following resolution: "Considérant que la Martinique, qui est française depuis plus de deux siècles, qui jouit, depuis 1870, des mêmes droits politiques que la métropole, se trouve dans les meilleures conditions possibles pour être assimilée complètement à la mère patrie. . . . Que, pour parvenir à cette assimilation tant désirée, l'assemblée locale abandonnerait sans regret tous les droits et prérogatives qu'elle tient du Sénatus-Consulte du 4 juillet 1866, et qui sont inconnus aux conseils généraux métropolitains; Le Conseil renouvelle, en l'accentuant, le vœu qu'il a émis le 24 novembre

<sup>1</sup> Cited in Aube, *La Martinique*, p. 46.

<sup>2</sup> Aube, *La Martinique*, p. 56.

<sup>3</sup> See *Annuaire de la Martinique*, 1900, p. 54.

1874, et demande que la Martinique soit constituée le plus tôt possible en département français." The general council of Guadeloupe had passed a similar resolution the preceding year.<sup>1</sup>

The complete success of the colored majority in the general council in vindicating its political importance aroused bitter feelings of apprehension and anger on the part of the whites. The papers which represented their opinion had always been exceedingly severe in their judgment of the political ambitions of the lower classes. They now began a campaign of unrestricted vilification. How far this was allowed to go will appear from the following extracts. They refer to the former slaves as "ceux qu'une destinée bienveillante designa pour cet exode" from Africa. "Mais, malheureux, sans nous, vos yeux n'auraient jamais vue la lumière, les ossements de vos pères joncheraient les autels de vos dieux, et leurs crânes s'amoncèleraient en pyramides sinistres autour des palais de vos rois. . . . Ce préjugé, dont vous vous plaignez, a sa source dans l'infériorité de votre race, dans la différence indélébile qui existe entre elle et la nôtre, et aussi, faut-il le dire? dans la faible tendance à l'élevation des sentiments qui se manifeste chez ceux d'entre vous qui ont goûté les bienfaits de l'éducation."<sup>2</sup>

As an organ of the colored politicians, the newspaper *Les Colonies* had been founded in 1878 by M. Hurard, later a deputy in the French Chamber, with the co-operation and under the protection of M. Schoelcher, a French senator, who had been a leader in the emancipation movement of 1848 and who had since that time exerted himself in constant endeavors to vindicate the political rights of the colored population. Having thus acquired an official paper the mulatto régime was becoming fully organized. For over a decade it governed the island without any competition on the part of the whites, who had withdrawn from politics and devoted themselves entirely to industrial pursuits. Certain politicians like M. Hurard or M. Deproge led the "yellow aristocracy" and disposed of the political patronage of the island. The unmixed African population as yet took but little part in political life. In 1881, by instigation of some whites, a committee calling themselves the "Fifty Negroes" organized for the purpose of drawing the negro peasants and laborers into politics. They were, however, severely reprimanded by Senator Schoelcher,<sup>3</sup> as introducing racial conflicts, and their agitation remained without result.

<sup>1</sup> Both resolutions are cited in Isaac, *Constitution et Sénatus-Consultes*, pp. 146, 150.

<sup>2</sup> *La Défense Coloniale*, février, 1882. Cited in Schoelcher, *Polémique Coloniale*, I. 11.

<sup>3</sup> His address to the committee is given in Schoelcher, *Polémique Coloniale*, II. 64.

During the decade which followed, Martinique suffered much from the sugar crisis of 1884. The millenium which had been expected to result from political freedom, failed to make its appearance. Much of the old charm of creole life in its patriarchal stage had passed away and the colored population found that independence and political rights brought struggles and responsibility as well as power. Pessimism as to the future of the island became general. "C'est un pays perdu," was the prevailing sentiment. Despairing of the situation, many whites withdrew from the island. As the official reports make no distinction between the white, colored, and black population but embrace them all under the term *creoles*, we must go to private accounts for indications of changes in the relative positions of the various populations. Governor Aube in 1882 estimated the white population at eight thousand. By 1888, according to Mr. Lafcadio Hearn,<sup>1</sup> the number had fallen to five thousand and the emigration of the whites was still going on.

The character of political life and action during this period will appear from a survey of the legislation. In December, 1884, the council-general suppressed the importation of contract labor, which had existed since 1853 and which had caused considerable friction between council and governor. The coolie population had reached its highest figure, 14,299, in 1882. By 1889 it fell to 8712, while at present there are only 4,665 Indian laborers left in Martinique.<sup>2</sup> In 1883 the attempt was made to introduce the policy of division of large estates. Landed estates that had been forfeited to the colony or had been acquired by other means were cut up into hectare holdings and granted out to the poor peasant population.<sup>3</sup> The laicization of the common school system, begun in 1881, was continued; by 1890 nine thousand pupils attended the public schools; this number rose to 12,000 within the following ten years. On the other hand public works and internal improvements received but little attention. The far-famed botanical garden at St. Pierre was allowed to relapse into a tropical wilderness. The appropriation for works in connection with the dry dock was reduced to 11,000 francs, while on the other hand 53,000 francs were spent in salaries in the dock administration.<sup>4</sup> Attempts at railway construction were abandoned, and the telegraph line which connected St. Pierre with Fort-de-France was not extended, nor was there any efficient improvement of the highways in the island.

<sup>1</sup> *Two Years in the French West Indies*, New York, 1890.

<sup>2</sup> *Annuaire de la Martinique*, 1900, p. 634.

<sup>3</sup> *Les Colonies* (the leading journal of Martinique), July 11 and October 6, 1900.

<sup>4</sup> *Annuaire de la Martinique*, 1900, p. 349.

It was not long before there appeared among the leaders of the mulattoes the signs of coming factional struggles. Two men contended for leadership and management of the political patronage, M. Hurard, the founder of *Les Colonies*, and M. Deproge, both representatives of Martinique in the national parliament. About these two men the factional strife began to centre,—a warfare of much bitterness in which no expedient was left untried. In order to gain more influence both sides appealed to the black electors, who had hitherto taken but little part in political life. M. Deproge, who was an exceedingly shrewd political organizer, succeeded finally in obtaining the control of the political patronage. M. Hurard, on the other hand, to counterbalance this influence preached the policy of reconciliation among all classes of the island, and their co-operation in a unified political life without factional struggles. Thus he not only appealed to the black population, but also favored the participation of the whites in the politics of the island, and caused them to be nominated for public office. The two parties were originally called simply *Hurardist* and *Deprogeist*, but as the breach between them became irremediable, they assumed the names of Republican-Progressist and Socialist respectively. Since the middle of the last decade, the whites have entered politics in large numbers, making use of the former party to give expression to their political aims. In the parliamentary election of 1898 the Progressists were successful; one of their candidates, M. Guibert, a resident of France, had been selected as a mark of conciliation between the races.<sup>1</sup> The other, M. Duguesnay, was one of the original leaders of the colored party in 1878. These two men are the deputies of Martinique in the national parliament at the present time. In the senatorial election which followed in 1899, upon the death of Senator Allègre, victory was with the Socialists, who had nominated M. Knight, a wealthy distiller and landowner. By the exigencies of colonial politics, this capitalist is now forced to make common cause in France with Fournière, Millerand, Rochefort, and Guesde. In Martinique the two parties are at present in a state of balance, the Socialists having a majority of one in the general council.

We must not, however, attribute to these parties a close adhesion to the principles advocated by the parties bearing the same names in France. Thus the Socialists, whose leaders are taken from among the property-holding colored bourgeoisie, pursue none of the measures favored by true Socialists. They leave the building of roads in private hands and refuse to pass a progressive income-tax, or vote subventions for old-age insurance; moreover they show no

<sup>1</sup> *Les Colonies*, April 11, 1900.

hostility to the Church but rather seek its favor. Their chief exertion seems to be to work on the dissatisfaction of the agricultural population by making vague promises of better wages, as well as by insinuating that the whites are trying to recover authority to gain the suffrage of the masses.<sup>1</sup> The Republican-Progressists on the other hand engage in so-called patronal socialism. They encourage the establishment of old-age pensions by the employers with subvention by the state. In their election manifestoes they state "We are representatives of the school of Brisson and Bourgeois, who have assisted in the triumph of the Republicans without leading the people to violence. We favor a policy of tolerance. The industrial proprietors ask for quiet and peace not sectary politics."<sup>2</sup>

The strife between the two factions is full of bitterness and animosity. Election frauds,<sup>3</sup> political duels, and even assassinations are the constant accompaniment of electoral battles. The masses, the agricultural population, are appealed to by both sides, which puts them in a state of unrest and excitement. Political agitation of this kind led to a veritable drama in the year 1900. During the two preceding elections, both parties had made lavish promises of increased wages and "better times" to the proletariat. As the hopes thus raised were disappointed, there occurred in February, 1900, a large strike among the laborers on the sugar estates, resulting in the destruction of property. Military aid was summoned and a bloody encounter took place at the village of François, in which twelve laborers were killed and many seriously wounded. Although order was thus restored the lamentable event left behind it the most bitter feelings among the various classes of the island. It also led to an interpellation in parliament, which illustrates the manner of dealing with colonial questions in the home legislature. In the Chamber of Deputies the two Progressists of Martinique tried to fix the responsibility for the event upon the Socialists and upon the governor, who is a protégé of the Socialist leaders. Their principal effort seemed to be to use this occurrence for the purpose of getting the official patronage of the island into their hands. The Waldeck-Rousseau government had so far classed these deputies with the Nationalists and had not allowed them any influence over the patron-

<sup>1</sup> *Les Colonies*, March 17, 1900.

<sup>2</sup> *Les Colonies*, Oct. 6, 1900. The following election manifesto of a M. Paul Gaillardin is amusing in its naïveté. "Je suis un républicain convaincu, j'aime la République, ses lois sociales, ses institutions libérales et démocratiques, surtout lorsque ces lois et institutions sont appliquées par de représentants justes et comme moi, aimant la liberté."

<sup>3</sup> *Les Colonies*, Aug. 11 and Sept. 25, 1900.

age, which was retained by the Socialist senator. While the deputies thus made a purely political and administrative question of the strike, the French Socialist deputies treated it as an economic strike due to the insufficient payment of the laborers and to the unfulfilled ante-election promises of the proprietors. The debate, however, left the field of colonial politics, when M. Ribot bitterly assailed the ministry for its alliance with the Socialists. Thereupon the latter, although inclined to censure the government for the use of troops against striking laborers, joined in the vote of confidence for the reason, as given by M. Carnaud, that they "did not wish to furnish an occasion to some ambitious men for gathering up a port-folio from the blood of the laborers of Martinique." The vote passed by a majority of forty-one.<sup>1</sup>

The financial situation of the colonies is at present far from prosperous. Although there is no large public debt, the financial resources will be strained to the uttermost by the withdrawal of the subvention so far allowed by the French government. By the law of April 13, 1900, which went into effect on January 1, 1901, the colonies which have general councils are held responsible for all civil and police expenditures incurred by them. The only expenditures that will be met by the mother country are those for the military and naval defense. In this manner the amount to be met by the budget of Martinique will be increased from 5,729,000 francs in 1900 to about 8,000,000 francs.<sup>2</sup> As a return for this added financial burden, the colonies have asked for an increased autonomy of their general councils.<sup>3</sup> By the tariff law of January 11, 1892, the powers of these councils had been cut down, inasmuch as the colonies were made subject to the French tariff and could no longer have a special customs system as under the *Sénatus-Consulte* of 1866. But at present there seems to be little disposition on the part of the French government to add to the colonial autonomy. In his speech during the interpellation of March 26 the Minister of Colonies, M. Decrais, said: "I believe that the authority of the government must be fortified, that it must be freed from all local influences." He added: "Il faut le dire, les passions politiques et électorales sont si vives sous ce climat ardent et dans cette île resserrée, elles y ont créée une telle atmosphère des haines personnelles

<sup>1</sup> The whole interpellation is reported in *Les Colonies*. It took place on March 26, 1900.

<sup>2</sup> *Les Colonies*, August 6, 1900.

<sup>3</sup> See the proposal of M. Ursleur, deputy of Guiana, cited in *Annales des Sciences Politiques*, March, 1900, p. 233. He says: "Nous demandons à payer l'impôt du sang, nous demandons à rester citoyens français, mais nous désirons gérer nous-mêmes nos finances."

et locales, que la Chambre et le Gouvernement doivent y porter toute leur attention."

M. Picanon, the colonial inspector who visited the Antilles in 1900, expressed his dissatisfaction with the excessive functionarism in the islands. It was his opinion that the functionaries must be separated from politics and that the disastrous interference of politics with industry must cease. Political interference is especially dangerous in a small country with monoculture. His concrete recommendations are that there be instituted an irremovable magistrature of metropolitan origin and that the gendarmerie be put under the control of the governor instead of the *maires*.<sup>1</sup> There is therefore little likelihood that the demands of the colonies for further autonomy will find a favorable hearing with the government.

By the law of July 7, 1900, the French colonial army was organized. Even as far back as 1848, by the decree of May 3, the French laws of recruitment were made applicable to the colonies. The decree was never put into execution, but the organic law of the national army of July 15, 1889, again imposed the duty of military service upon the colonists. It was not however until 1900 that provisions for the actual organization of this part of the army were made. The colonial papers had always professed the eagerness of the colonists to pay the "impost of blood," and the final execution of the law was met with apparent enthusiasm, which is explained by the fact that service under the French colors is looked upon as imparting a new dignity to the negroes of the colonies.

It would be interesting to dwell on the mental characteristics and the general culture of the population of the islands, but we can here only indicate some facts that have a direct bearing on political life. While the leaders of the colored class are enthusiastic for education, and while large amounts of the public money are annually spent for that purpose,<sup>2</sup> still the ignorance of the masses is matter of constant comment on the part of the colonial papers. Among a population of 187,692 there were, in 1894, eighty thousand persons above the age of fourteen who were unable to read and write, leaving only 47,600 who had those accomplishments.<sup>3</sup> The moral status of the population according to European standards is very low. Out of the number given above only 20,312 are married—that is, there are only about 10,000 households in Martinique, and three-fourths of the children are born out of wedlock. While the ceremonial of the Church still retains its

<sup>1</sup> *Les Colonies*, June 6, 1900.

<sup>2</sup> In the budget for 1900, 1,027,095 francs are appropriated for education, as over against 787,520 francs for public works. *Annuaire de la Martinique*, 1900, p. 296.

<sup>3</sup> *Annuaire de la Martinique*, 1900, p. 630.

hold on the masses of the population, they are more deeply influenced by the arts of the native sorcerers (*quimboiseurs*). The Church has never been in sympathy with the political ambitions of the mulattoes, and it bewails the bitter struggles which party politics have introduced. When asked to celebrate a mass to commemorate the twenty-five years of political service of Député Duquesnay, Abbé Parel of Fort-de-France expresses himself as follows: "Political ambition does wrong to the people; it works their ruin. We have just had an electoral battle which has furnished too many recruits to hospitals and prisons. What we need is unity of the country under the guidance of the Church. Party strife is unchristian."<sup>1</sup> The leaders of the mulatto party have exerted themselves to acquire the intellectual culture and the liberal principles of France. No more faithful exponent of the tenets of the older Liberalism could be imagined than the paper *Les Colonies*. Frequently, of course, this adoption of ideas is far from being an effective assimilation, and is only a very superficial acquisition producing ridiculous incongruities. Thus when M. Hurard spoke before a local labor union, the worthy negro who replied to him gave utterance to Orphic maxims such as "Heureux celui qui a pu créer des ingrats," and "L'exile est la récompense des grands hommes" (referring to M. Hurard's exile from office). The strikers at François addressed the gendarmes in Mirabeau's famous phrase, "We are here by the will of the people and we shall yield only to bayonets." A speaker at a public function thus apostrophized the mother country, "O France, berceau de la liberté, terre chérie, où poussent les plus beaux sentiments."<sup>2</sup> On the other hand when papers like *Les Colonies* discuss public questions they bring to bear a clearness of style and a moderation of judgment that do not allow one to suspect the bitter virulence of political strife in the Antilles. They are full of enthusiasm for popular education, for equality of rights, for a civilization of peace and industry, for a separation of church and state with complete religious toleration. Often there is a severe self-criticism entirely different from the ordinary wailing of tropical colonists to which the world has become callous from long hearing, far removed too from the supposed self-importance and vanity of a colored population. They recognize and lament the many evils of their political life, but plead for time in order that they may learn the lesson of self-government and improve their institutions by experience. A population that is thus struggling away from its inherited tendencies, tendencies that are threatening to engulf Hayti

<sup>1</sup> *Les Colonies*, May 29, 1900.

<sup>2</sup> *Les Colonies*, July 30, 1900.

in the darkness of savagery, certainly deserves credit and sympathy. It must, however, be remembered that it is only a small part of the population that is animated by these ideals. The masses lead a shiftless life of indolence and ignorance, much given to petty thieving, drink, and gambling,<sup>1</sup> and influenced by dark superstitions of African origin. Through the efforts of the political leaders these masses have recently come to take a greater share in political life. In 1894, out of 43,000 registered voters only 9,500 exercised their right of suffrage, while in the year 1900, 23,492 votes were cast by a total of 45,650 registered electors.<sup>2</sup> In districts where a candidacy is uncontested, the vote is naturally very light.

As we have seen, it has been attempted to stir up social discontent among the masses, in order to gain the suffrage of the black electors. The socialist agitation in the islands has taken a purely aggressive form, exhausting itself in negative criticism and doing little to promote social legislation. The target of popular discontent is the sole industry in the islands—the sugar culture. Far from prosperous on account of the competition of producers in other lands, the industry is constantly threatened by hostile legislation emanating from the colonial democracy. There are two methods of attack : by an enforced increase in wages, and by augmenting the export duty on sugar. In Martinique, laborers until recently were paid eight francs for six half-days' labor, that is a franc per half-day with a supplement of twenty-five per cent. provided they continued to work for six half-days. The laborers usually divide their day between work in the canefields of the sugar companies and the cultivation of their own small farms or gardens. By obligatory arbitration the wages were in 1900 forced up to fr. 1.25 and fr. 1.50 per half day.<sup>3</sup> As Hindu immigration has ceased since 1884 the employers are entirely dependent on native laborers. The export duty on sugar was recently raised from one franc to fr. 2.50 per one hundred kilograms in Guadeloupe, and from one franc to fr. 1.70 in Guiana.<sup>4</sup> The sugar culture with its vast estates and its memories of slavery finds little favor in the eyes of the blacks ; they prefer the parcellation of the tracts now owned by the industrials and the introduction of what has been called "a banana-patch civilization." M. Hurard expresses the inclination of the insular population to socialism in characteristic language ; he says, "We creoles follow France because we have absorbed the

<sup>1</sup> *Les Colonies*, October 5 and 12, 1900.

<sup>2</sup> Election reports in *Les Colonies*, May, 1900.

<sup>3</sup> Account of the interpellation of March 26, 1900, in *Les Colonies*.

<sup>4</sup> *Annales des Sciences Politiques*, March, 1900, p. 261.

French conception, because we are of past servitude and hence by atavism predisposed to integral enslavement in collectivism, because we poor islanders can have no ambitions beyond being functionaries." The present governor has gone so far as to declare that in Martinique the régime of large properties is incompatible with the actual social state. In order to maintain and protect it, he considers it indispensable that the laws which govern British dependencies be applied to the colonies.<sup>1</sup> The French Socialists look upon their colonial associates as an important accession to their force and are ever ready to defend the colored democracy. "For us Socialists the negro workmen of Martinique are brothers in humanity, having the same rights and aspirations. They have their place in our hearts."<sup>2</sup> They count upon the colonial deputies in their fights against the reactionary tendencies and the colonists in turn are always pointing to their services in the establishment and maintenance of republican institutions in the mother country, as a basis of their claim to have the principle of colonial representation preserved and extended.

From the experience of the French Antilles we can draw some general conclusions as to the working of the system of representation there in use. Considering first representation in the national parliament, we find that it has given the deputies themselves great personal influence. Since the ministries are usually in need of every vote that can be obtained and since the colonial deputies are more independent in national affairs than are those who have French constituencies, their support is always courted. The very adoption of the republican form of government in 1875 was made possible by the votes of the colonial deputies; the Wallon amendment, by which the title of president was bestowed upon MacMahon, was passed by a majority of only one vote. In 1882, just when the affairs of the French nation were in a serious crisis, M. Blancsubé, the deputy for Cochin-China, was the leader in bringing about the overthrow of the Freycinet government. The colonial deputies and senators are by virtue of their office members of the *Conseil Supérieur des Colonies*, the assembly upon whose advice the colonial ministry bases its action. They also take a leading part in all congresses where colonial questions are discussed. The important International Congress of 1889 and the French national congress of 1890 were practically led in all their resolutions by Senator Isaac of Guadeloupe. He there favored not only the complete assimilation of the older colonies to the metropolitan institutions and the

<sup>1</sup> Cited in the course of the interpellation of March 26, 1900, *Les Colonies*.

<sup>2</sup> M. Alexandre Zévaès in the interpellation of March 26, 1900, *Les Colonies*.

abolishment of the "régime of decrees," but he also carried a resolution favoring a like policy for all colonial dependencies of France.<sup>1</sup> To the influence of the colonial deputies more than to any other cause may be attributed the persistence of the assimilation policy in French colonization. By the very act of vindicating their privileges of representation they favor the extension of these principles to the newer colonies; and as they are not only specially interested, but are also considered specially competent in colonial affairs, their influence has been preponderant. They were not able, however, to prevent the ultimate establishment of a separate ministry of colonies, which they had long resisted. Since 1882 there had been attempts to organize the colonial service apart from the Ministry of Marine. It was attached alternately to the latter and to the Ministry of Commerce. Under the policy of assimilation carried to its logical conclusion a separate ministry of colonies is unnecessary, as each of the ministries in France manages its respective share of affairs in the colonies; such is the arrangement with respect to Algiers, and this was what the colonial deputies had hoped to attain in their own case. The importance of the newer colonies and the growth of interest in colonial expansion led, however, to the establishment of a separate ministry by the law of March 20, 1894. As this ministry is naturally more interested in the newly acquired vast domains of France in Africa and in Asia than in the older colonies, the influence of the colonial representatives has been diminished in consequence of its creation.

No direct beneficial influence of the system of parliamentary representation on the colonies themselves can be traced, except in the matter of obtaining occasional favors of a fiscal nature, such as subventions and exemptions.<sup>2</sup> No thorough-going reforms in colonial affairs have been suggested or carried out by the colonial representatives. This is partly due, of course, to the fact that parliament does not as a general rule interfere with colonial affairs, but leaves their management to the executive. The representatives are accordingly inclined to view the affairs of their constituencies from a narrow partisan point of view. We have already alluded to the manner in which the senators and deputies of Martinique made of the strike a mere question for the control of patronage. A deputy of Guade-

<sup>1</sup> Procès-Verbaux du Congrès colonial National. Cited in Alcindor, *Les Antilles Françaises*, Paris, 1899, p. 104. "La nation est obligée en conscience de faire participer ses nouveaux sujets, dans la mesure du possible, aux avantages que lui assure à elle même la supériorité de sa culture et de son état social." Procès-Verbaux du Congrès International de 1889. Cited in De Saussure, *Psychologie de la Colonisation Française*, p. 256.

<sup>2</sup> Thus, e. g., Senator Cicero of Guadeloupe obtained a reduction of the charges imposed upon his colony in 1900. *Les Colonies*, April 11, 1900.

loupe has described the situation as follows : " The greatest part of their activity is given, no matter what repugnance they may feel thereto, to the task of cultivating the good will of the minister towards their friends among the colonial functionaries. They must constantly be on their guard against adverse influence and spend their time soliciting support in the bureaus. The colonial elections have become a matter of mere personal antagonism."<sup>1</sup>

As we turn from representation in the national parliament to the local colonial council we find that it is animated by the same political desires as the deputies and senators in Paris, and that its chief concern is the control of the patronage. The uppermost consideration in the mind of a councillor is always the gaining of votes through local influence, or the punishment or reward of the administrative departments according to the attitude they have taken toward his election.<sup>2</sup> The fiscal policy of the councils is governed by the same considerations. Expenses for public improvements of an industrial nature, such as harbors and roads, are constantly kept down. On the other hand since the influence of the general council grows with the number of officials dependent on it, the expenditure for salaries is constantly increasing. Thus, Martinique has 1400 functionaries out of 14,000 men who could possibly hold civil service positions.<sup>3</sup> The bane of functionarism is fixed upon the colonies, and political life has consequently become an acrid struggle for personal influence and patronage. By the side of this expenditure for the civil service, large sums are voted for public education and scholarships ; the latter fulfill the double purpose of advancing learning and providing for the protégés of the politicians. Large grants and concessions are often made out of the public property ; thus, the council of Guiana granted 200,000 hectares of valuable land to one individual, and at the same time proposed to divide the colonial reserve fund among the communes.<sup>4</sup>

It may be interesting to glance for a moment at the parallel experience of Great Britain with the island of Jamaica. Although the English have tried representative institutions in the tropical colonies, they have never adopted manhood suffrage. The measures by which, under Lord Derby's administration of the Colonial Office in

<sup>1</sup> Letter in *L'Indépendant de la Guadeloupe*, February 16, 1899. Merivale in his lectures on colonization (1841) expresses the belief that colonial representatives would be mere party agents in Parliament.

<sup>2</sup> Debate in the General Council of Guiana, cited in *Annales des Sciences Politiques*, XV. 256.

<sup>3</sup> *Les Colonies*, Sept. 15, 1900. Also Mr. Austin Lee's *Report on French Colonies*, published by the British Foreign Office, 1900.

<sup>4</sup> *Annales des Sciences Politiques*, XV. 259.

1884, representative institutions were introduced into Jamaica and Mauritius restricted the electorate by a high property qualification; so that for instance in Mauritius out of a population of 400,000 inhabitants there are only 3,000 voters. In Jamaica, Lord Derby accorded to the elective members of the colonial council the control over the finances of the island. We cannot here trace the history of the last fifteen years, but the most recent developments are so interesting that they deserve notice in connection with the experience in the French Antilles. On account of financial difficulties into which the colony had fallen, a royal commission was appointed to investigate the situation and make suggestions. The outcome was the report by Sir David Barbour<sup>1</sup> in which he criticizes the Jamaican financial management and especially the habit of borrowing for the construction of public works not directly productive. He also records "a serious defect in system in so far as regards the relations between the Colonial Office, the governor of the colony, and the elected members" which he considers "inseparable from any attempt to combine in a working compromise the conflicting systems of crown government and representative government." He believes that the constitution of Jamaica has aggravated the present financial difficulties, that it leads to much friction and loss of time without a satisfactory result. The colonial legislature is also criticized for refusing to vote the salary of a necessary official and because the unofficial members pressed for an increase in the educational credit. In his letter of instruction<sup>2</sup> to the governor, Mr. Chamberlain takes up these objections and enforces them from his own experience, as when he says that he favors retrenchment in the expenditure for education, which has not, he thinks, produced results commensurate with the outlay. He then instructs the governor to appoint the full number of official members and to retain them so as to place the elected members in a permanent minority in the council. He bases his action on the principle that "where financial assistance is given a colony by the imperial government, the latter must have control over the finances." Of course, the Jamaicans most vehemently protest against this suppression of the powers of their representatives. The mayor and council of Kingston in a petition to the Queen, submitted that "to reduce the educational vote will work a vast amount of harm for which no prosperity in other directions can compensate."<sup>3</sup> But as financial and industrial relations are uppermost in the mind of the Secretary for the Colonies, it is very un-

<sup>1</sup> *Parliamentary Blue Books*, C.—9412, July, 1899.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. 22, 1899, *Parliamentary Blue Books*, Cd. 125, April, 1900, p. 6.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 32.

likely that he will modify his decision. He has thereby clearly entered upon the policy of doing away with representative institutions in the tropics. And in general, English statesmen have at present little but criticism for the policy of Lord Derby, whose Liberalism they consider decidedly unpractical.

In France too there are many indications of a changed attitude of the public mind on questions of colonial politics. Formerly the ideal of assimilation was proclaimed as the national policy almost without a dissenting voice. In the *exposé des motifs du Sénatus-consulte de 1854*, we find this statement: "L'assimilation progressive des colonies à la mère-patrie est dans la nature des choses, dans le vœu légitime des populations, et peut-être aussi dans les devoirs du gouvernement métropolitain." The commission of forty-five members nominated by the National Assembly at Bordeaux in 1871 voted: "Prenons pour devise: Assimilation politique des colonies à la mère-patrie."<sup>1</sup> During the two decades that followed, all the important organic laws of France were applied also to the colonies. The colonial commission appointed by Admiral Pothuau in 1878, and that named by Minister Duclerc in 1882, both pronounced in favor of assimilation, as did also the Colonial Congresses of 1889 and 1890. But within the last decade a new tendency has made itself felt. Already in 1888, Minister Dislère's scheme for further assimilation of the old colonies by erecting them into departments was defeated in the parliament. The troubles in the Antilles as well as the disappointment which the French attempts at legal assimilation suffered in Annam have led many politicians to question the wisdom of the traditional policy. Moreover the experience of the French with Tunis, where they have used the system of a protectorate without assimilation, has been so much more satisfactory than in Algiers or Indo-China, that the lesson has impressed itself strongly upon the minds of statesmen and publicists. In 1898 M. D'Estournelles de Constant introduced a bill for the suppression of the parliamentary representation of Senegal, French India, and Cochin-China. He believes that the system is so firmly fixed in the Antilles that, for sentimental reasons, it may there be allowed to continue, but he strenuously opposes the extension of the principle to the other colonies.<sup>2</sup> M. Doumer, Governor-general of Indo-China, in his report to the Minister of Colonies in 1900, discourages the idea of legislative and social assimilation.<sup>3</sup> M. P. Leroy-Beaulieu, too, believes in administrative and financial decentralization

<sup>1</sup> March 28, 1870. Cited in Schoelcher, *Polémique Coloniale*, I. 16.

<sup>2</sup> D'Estournelles de Constant, *Contre la Résistance Coloniale*, in *La Revue de Paris*, January 1, 1899.

<sup>3</sup> Cited in *U. S. Consular Reports*, Dec., 1900, p. 496.

and considers self-government and universal suffrage in the colonies as an absurd institution.<sup>1</sup>

Here for the present the matter rests. It is clear that the function of the French Antilles as models for colonial legislation is past and that, while their institutions will perhaps not be disturbed, the French colonial administration will be guided more by English experience and by the evident demands of the great colonies recently acquired by the French Republic. For these tropical colonies, it is believed that experienced administration is the main consideration, and that a settled society should not be disturbed and distracted by the introduction of European institutions and the unrest of party politics. Instead of favoring general assimilation, French statesmen are beginning to show a more practical spirit in the endeavor to take account of the peculiar needs of populations in the most varied stages of development.

PAUL S. REINSCH.

<sup>1</sup> *L'Économiste Français*, Jan. 27, 1900.

## DOCUMENTS

### *1. The Society of Dissenters founded at New York in 1769.*

HISTORIANS have long recognized more or less fully the importance of the controversies which, about the middle of the eighteenth century, prevailed between Anglicans and Dissenters in the colonies over the question of a colonial episcopate and other related subjects. The special conditions attending these discussions in New York have also been explained. It has been noticed that the discussion over the founding of King's College constituted one phase of the subject. The fact that, when the Revolution began, the Presbyterians of New York City had long but vainly been seeking a charter of incorporation for themselves as a religious society, has also been brought out. They denied the validity of the interpretation put by the officials on the act of 1693, to the effect that it established the Church of England in the four southern counties of the province. They also denied that the English Church was *de jure* established in all the colonies, and therefore that Dissenters were subject to all the regulations prescribed in the Act of Toleration. Presbyterians also sought to obtain for themselves the position of advantage secured for the sect in Scotland by the Act of Union. In April, 1769, and repeatedly thereafter, efforts were made to pass acts relieving Dissenters from the payment of taxes for the support of the clergy of a church to which they did not belong. But these efforts all failed because of the opposition of the Council; it would make no concession to the demand.

That, along with the Presbyterian clergymen of the city, William Livingston, John Morin Scott and Alexander McDougall were prominently connected with the movement, is also well known. The activity of Livingston as a pamphleteer and contributor to the newspapers in the Presbyterian interest, has been clearly described by his biographer and others. But hitherto writers have failed to understand how definite was the form taken by the Presbyterian movement, and what wide-reaching plans these bodies cherished for securing united action on the part of Dissenters generally throughout the colonies against British and Anglican claims. Had these plans been carried into execution, a religious character would have been given to the Revolution.

The document which is here printed shows the ultimate point reached by the Presbyterians as agitators and the plan of operations which they had formulated early in 1769. It was recently discovered among a mass of judicial records which are stored in the vaults of the Court House of New York County. It consists of minutes of various meetings held during the months of February and March, 1769, by leading members of the Presbyterian and Baptist churches of New York City, in which they organized themselves as a "Society of Dissenters." Their object was to protest and to enlarge their rights. It was intended that this society should be the parent of a federation of similar societies, and that these, like the political communities of the time, should be bound together by committees of correspondence. But beyond the issue of the circular letter printed here, the movement scarcely went. The minutes abruptly close with the entry for March 21, 1769. They occupy the early pages of a volume of ordinary ledger size, which in 1791 was filled with entries of writs by one of the clerks of the Supreme Court of the state.

A part of these minutes, viz., the Articles of Agreement and the Circular Letter, were printed in Gaine's *New York Gazette*, July 24, 1769. This was done by one of the Anglican opponents of the Dissenters. In the next number, that of July 31, appeared an unsigned letter (from a Presbyterian) avowing the Circular Letter and the Articles which had been printed, and declaring the intention to continue meetings and keep up the agitation against the establishment of bishops. A few other references to the matter appear in contemporary newspapers, but nothing of special consequence, save a circular letter published by Gaine, September 25, 1769, which was prepared in March, 1764, by certain Presbyterians of Pennsylvania for the purpose of bringing about closer union. These articles, however, make no express reference to Anglicans. Since Gaine's *Gazette* is so rare, and we apparently now have a correct copy of the minutes of all, or nearly all, the meetings that were held, it has been deemed advisable to print the minutes in full.

HERBERT L. OSGOOD.

NEW YORK, February 17th 1769.

Whereas it is of the utmost Importance for the different Christian Denominations in the Country, not belonging to the Church, professing themselves to be in Communion with the Church of England, to unite together for the preservation of their common and respective civil and religious Rights and Privileges, against all Oppressions and Encroachments by those of any Denomination whatsoever; it is thought proper for

that purpose, to form a Society for taking Care of the said common and respective, Civil and Religious Rights and Privileges, of those of their Brethren in the Colony of New York, and the Neighboring Colonies, who do not profess to belong to the said Church, professing themselves to be in Communion with the Church of England: And for that purpose the following Persons voluntarily met together to wit.

Messrs. PETER VAN BRUGH LIVING-

STON	WILLIAM M <sup>c</sup> KINLEY
HENRY WILLIAMS	ROBERT BOYD
SAMUEL BROOME	FRANCIS VAN DYCKE
THOMAS SMITH	SAMUEL EDMONDS
ALEXANDER M <sup>c</sup> DOUGALL	JONATHAN BLAKE
SAMUEL LOUDON	WILLIAM NEILSON
WILLIAM GOFORTH	JOHN BROOME and
JOSEPH HALLETT	JOHN M <sup>c</sup> KESSON
JOHN MORIN SCOTT	
WILLIAM LIVINGSTON	

The above named Gentlemen being so met together for the purpose aforesaid did unanimously elect Mr. Peter Van Brugh Livingston their Moderator for the present Meeting. And thereupon it was unanimously agreed,

1<sup>st</sup> That the Society do appoint a Secretary to make Entries of their Transactions who shall remain their Secretary for one year at least and that John M<sup>c</sup>Kesson be the Secretary of Society for the present year.

2<sup>nd</sup> That fifteen members of the said Society shall form a Quorum to proceed on Business at any Meeting.

3<sup>rd</sup> That for the present the said Society is not to exceed the Number of Sixty Persons in the whole.

4<sup>th</sup> That for the present this Society will receive as Members thereof from the Presbyterian Church in the City under the pastoral Charge of the Reverend Mr. Mason any number not exceeding five: From the Baptist Church in this City under the pastoral Charge Reverend Mr. any number not exceeding seven; and from the Presbyterian Church in this City under the pastoral Charge of the Reverend Messrs. Rodgers and Treat any Number not exceeding sixteen.

5<sup>th</sup> That it shall be in the power of a Majority of the Members now present belonging to the two presbyterian Churches and the Baptist Church to nominate such other persons belonging to their particular Churches to fill up their respective Numbers in the said Society as they shall think proper.

6<sup>th</sup> That this Society shall meet on the —— Evening in every Week until they shall agree to meet seldom: And that on every special Emergency the Secretary with the Leave of the Moderator shall be authorized to summon a special Meeting of the said Society at other times to be notified to one Member of this Society belonging to each Congregation.

7<sup>th</sup>y That no Matters of Doctrine, Church Discipline, or Worship shall ever be the subject either of the Acts or Conversation of the said Society.

8<sup>th</sup>y That the Society shall as their last Act at every Meeting chuse a Moderator for the next ensuing Meeting; and that the Moderator for the Time being, immediately before such Election, shall fix the Hour and place for such Meeting.

9<sup>th</sup>y That there shall be a standing Committee for Correspondence appointed who shall have it in Charge, to write to such proper persons not belonging to the Church professing themselves to be in Communion of the Church of England in the several Counties in this Colony, and the neighboring Colonies, as are of sufficient Influence for that purpose, to constitute as many Societies as may be thought proper to correspond with this Society, respecting such Matters as properly fall within the Design for which this Society is constituted. And that the said Committee of Correspondence, do from Time to Time lay before the Society such Letters as they shall write before they shall be sent, and also the Letters which they shall from Time to Time receive, which shall from Time to Time be filed [by] the Secretary of the Society.

10<sup>th</sup>y That in every different part of the Country, whether in this or the Neighboring Colonies, where a like Society shall be established such Society shall be entitled to send a Delegate to the Meetings of this Society, who shall have an equal Voice with any other Member of this Society.

11<sup>th</sup>y That at every Meeting of this Society the Proceedings of their last Meeting shall be read by their Secretary, immediately after the Moderator has taken the Chair; and before the Society proceeds to any Business.

12<sup>th</sup>y That for the Preservation of good Order, when any Member speaks on any Matter in this Society, he shall always address himself to the Moderator in the Chair. That no more than one Member shall speak at a Time; and that no Member speak more than once to the same point on any particular Matter or Subject in debate.

13<sup>th</sup>y That no Member shall speak on any Subject not properly within the Design of this Institution, whilst the Moderator is in the Chair.

14<sup>th</sup>y That no Member shall depart from the said Society whilst the Moderator is in the Chair without his Leave.

It is ordered by the Moderator that this Society do meet at the House of David Phillipse in —— Street in the North ward of this City at six of the Clock.

And lastly William Livingston Esq. is elected Moderator of this Society for the next ensuing Meeting.

At a Meeting of this Society according to Appointment of the Moderator at the House of David Phillipse on Tuesday the Twenty-first day of February 1769.

Present WILLIAM LIVINGSTON ESQUIRE Moderator.	
Messrs. HENRY WILLIAMS	ROBERT BOYD
SAMUEL BROOME	FRANCIS VAN DYCK
PETER VAN BRUGH LIVINGSTON	WILLIAM M'KINLEY
ALEXANDER M'DOUGALL	WILLIAM GOFORTH
SAMUEL LOUDEN	SAMUEL EDMONDS
JOHN MORIN SCOTT	JOHN BROOME and
WILLIAM NEILSON	JOHN MCKESSON

According to the Eleventh general Rule of the Society the proceedings of the last Meeting were read.

A Majority of the Members of this Society who belong to the Presbyterian Church under the pastoral Charge of the Reverend Messrs. Rodgers and Treat being present to wit Mr. Moderator, Messrs. Peter Van Brugh Livingston, John Broome, John Morin Scott Alexander McDougall William Neilson Samuel Broome and John McKesson do nominate Messrs. David Van Horne and Peter R. Livingston two Gentlemen belonging to their particular Church and present them to this Society to be Members thereof and they are unanimously received accordingly.

All the Members of this Society who belong to the Baptist Church under the pastoral charge of the Revd. Mr: —— being present to wit Messrs. Henry Williams, Samuel Edmonds Francis Van Dyck and William Goforth do nominate Messrs. John Stites, Isaac Skillman and William Lawson three Gentlemen belonging to their particular Church and present them to this Society to be members thereof and they are unanimously received accordingly; which Gentlemen compleat the Number of Members allotted to that Church by the fourth general Rule of this Society.

A Majority of the Members of this Society who belong to the presbyterian Church under the pastoral Charge of the Reverend Mr. Mason being present, to wit Messrs. Samuel Loudon Robert Boyd and William M'Kinley do nominate Mr. Alexander Robertson a Gentleman belonging to their particular Church and present him to this Society to be a Member thereof and he is unanimously received accordingly which Gentleman completes the Number of Members allotted to that Church by the fourth general Rule of this Society.

The Society Agree that nine of their Members be appointed a Committee for Correspondence to bring in a Draft or Drafts of Letter or Letters to be laid before this Society, as soon as the said Committee shall have such Draft or Drafts as they shall think proper prepared for that purpose ; And that any Gentleman who is Moderator for the Time being by reason of the short duration of his Office may be appointed a Member of any Standing Committee ; And that the said Committee for Correspondence shall be Elected by Ballot and shall be and remain a Standing Committee for one year.

The Society then proceeded to elect by Ballot nine of their Members to be a Standing Committee for Correspondencies whereupon the follow-

ing Gentlemen were duly elected to form the said Committee viz. Messrs. Peter Van Brugh Livingston Henry Williams, John Morin Scott, William Livingston, David Van Horne, Peter R. Livingston, Alexander McDougall, John Broome and Samuel Loudon.

Mr. Moderator appoints next Tuesday Evening at six of the Clock at this House of David Phillips to be the Time and place for the next Meeting of this Society.

And Lastly, Mr. Henry Williams is elected Moderator for the next ensuing Meeting of this Society.

At a Meeting of the Society pursuant to \_\_\_\_\_ of the Moderator at the House of David Phillips on Tuesday Evening the Twenty Eighth of February 1769.

Present Mr. HENRY WILLIAMS Moderator.

Messrs. THOMAS SMITH	ALEXANDER M'DOUGALL
DAVID VAN HORNE	ALEXANDER ROBERTSON
PETER V. B. LIVINGSTON	SAMUEL EDMONDS
SAMUEL LOUDON	JOHN STITES
W <sup>m</sup> GOFORTH	ISAAC SKILLMAN
SAMUEL BROOME	WILLIAM M'KINLEY
WILLIAM LIVINGSTON	JONATHAN BLAKE
FRANCIS VAN DYCKE	ROBERT BOYD and
PETER R. LIVINGSTON	JOHN MCKESSON

Pursuant to the Eleventh general Rule of the Society the Minutes of the last Preceding Meeting were read.

A Majority of the Members of this Society who belong to the Presbyterian Chh. under the pastoral Charge of the Reverend Messrs. Rodgers and Treat being present to wit Messrs. David Van Horne Peter Van Brugh Livingston Thomas Smith Samuel Broome William Livingston Peter R. Livingston Alexander McDougall and John McKesson do nominate Doctor Benjamin Y Prime a Gentleman belonging to their particular Church and present him to this Society to be a member thereof and he is unanimously received accordingly.

Mr. Moderator appoints next Monday Evening for the next meeting of this Society at this House of Mr. Phillips at six of the Clock in the Evening.

And lastly Mr. David Van Horne is elected Moderator for the next Meeting of this Society.

At a Meeting of the Society according to the Adjournment of the Moderator at the House of David Phillips on Monday the Sixth of March 1769.

Present Mr. DAVID VAN HORNE Moderator.

Messrs. HENRY WILLIAMS	WILLIAM LIVINGSTON
ALEXR. M'DOUGALL	PETER R. LIVINGSTON
WILLIAM NEILSON	ISAAC SKILLMAN
JOSEPH HOLLETT	WILLIAM GOFORTH

SAMUEL BROOME

PETER V. B. LIVINGSTON

BENJ. Y. PRIME

WILLIAM MCKINLEY

SAMUEL LOUDEN

JOHN M'KESSON

ROBERT BOYD and

JOHN STITES

FRANCIS VAN DYCKE

ALEXANDER ROBERTSON

Pursuant to the Eleventh general Rule of the Society the Minutes of the last preceding Meeting were read.

The Committee of Correspondence reported to the Society a draft of a Letter to be sent to such Correspondents as the Society shall think proper which draft being corrected by the Society and finally approved of is in the words following to wit.

*New York*

As civil and religious Liberty is justly esteemed amongst the greatest of human Blessings, the loss of which must necessarily be attended with the most complicated misery, it cannot be doubted that its preservation merits our most vigorous Efforts. No man duly sensible of its inestimable Value, but will acknowledge it our indispensable Duty, by every lawful means to preserve it to ourselves and transmit it to Posterity.

The History of all ages furnishes abundant and melancholy proofs, that even the best of men (such is the pride and ambition of human nature) have too frequently abused an undue share of power; and that it is therefore an Argument of the Wisdom, as well as productive of the Happiness of a People, to preserve a just Ballance in the different branches of Government, both civil and religious: And though it is well known that most of our Colonies have hitherto held their privileges in tollerable security; Yet no one who is properly sensible of that important Blessing, can help being alarmed at the Attempts lately made by many of the Episcopal Clergy, and some of their Laity, to introduce Bishops into America. They have not only planned their Scheme, but have pursued it as far as our Watchfulness on this side the *Atlantic*, and the political jealousies on the other would permit. And as we have the utmost reason to fear, that they have not abandoned the project, we ought still to be on our Guard, lest our Inattention should facilitate its accomplishment. Should such be the Event, *how terrifying the prospect!* We should soon be obliged to bid farewell to that religious Liberty, in which CHRIST hath set us free; and instead of that divine Satisfaction which flows from the uninterrupted enjoyment of the Rights of private Judgment, and the Worship of God according to our Consciences, (for which some of our forefathers left their native Country, and took sanctuary in this then uncultivated Wilderness, from the oppression of *Ecclesiastical power*) the introduction of Episcopacy would immediately fill our Hearts with just forebodings of Evil. For it is much to be feared, that so extraordinary and dangerous an Innovation, would sooner or later be attended with

such Restraints, impositions and penalties on all Nonconformists as would make Life itself intolerable. The Non-Episcopalians have the greater reason to be alarmed at the Attempt to introduce Episcopacy, when they already see the members of that Church Pursuing measures for ingrossing an inordinate share of power; while themselves, tho' ten to one in this Colony, are treated with open Contempt; and publicly told by the warm Advocates of prelacy, that they ought to be tributaries to the Church; nor be suffered to enjoy any post, either of honor, trust, or profit. Our fears are greatly increased, when we consider the Episcopal Church possessed of so immense an Estate in this City; and her members enjoying the Principal part of the wealth of the Metropolis: not that we envy either the Corporation of that Church, or any private member belonging to it, in any part of their Possessions: We only notice their superior riches, as an unsailing Source of Superior influence; an influence sufficient unless opposed by the union of all the other denominations to carry almost every Election here. By the policy of the Constitution, they are secure of the Countenance of the Crown, the Governor and the Council; and consequently of a preference respecting all Officers and favors in the Gift of the Government; while the only security left to their brethren of different persuasions, is to avail themselves of their numbers, and to preserve a Majority in the house of representatives. Of this preference we can need no other Proof, than the Liberality of the Government to them, in the Grant of large Tracts of Land in every new township, for a parsonage glebe, and for the Society for propagating the Gospel; while the churches of every other denomination are refused even the comparatively trifling favor of a Charter, to enable them to enjoy the benefit of private Donations. Of this the Episcopalians are fully sensible; and therefore, though it is evident that where [were] we wholly to engross the representative Body, and fill every Elective Office in the Colony, they by having a triple check upon us would be safe against all possible attempts by those of other persuasions; they are Nevertheless Strenuously Endeavoring to Obtain a Majority in those Elective Offices, in which our only security consists. These Considerations ought to teach those whom they term Dissenters, to make it a maxim of their Conduct, to be jealous of bestowing these Offices on Episcopalians, as thereby they evidently weaken the Grand Bulwark of their Liberty.

These reasons have induced a number of Gentlemen of different denominations to meet, and form themselves into a Society, for the preservation of their common Liberty. We do by no means propose to Act Offensively against the Episcopalians, but barely to Counteract them, as far as we shall discover them pursuing designs unfriendly to our General interest. We can with Great Truth and Sincerity declare, that we would not, if it were in our power, deprive that Church of any Enjoyment save only that of Applying our property to her Support, which she does in four Counties in this province; and has in one of them Attempted to Enlarge her establishment: And we have but too much reason to suspect from her

unwearied pains and struggles for Power, that it is with a View to Obtain an Ascendancy in the House of representatives, sufficient to enable her to make such establishment General through the province; or to some other designs unfavorable to those of different persuasions. Why else is she not satisfied with her Already disproportionate degree of power before mentioned? We only desire ourselves to enjoy and to transmit to our posterity the right of private Judgment; and of Worshipping God according to the dictates of our own Consciences. For this important purpose, and to Strengthen our interest, we propose to Write to all our brethren on the Continent, to exhort them to form themselves into such Societies, to Correspond with each other on these Interesting concerns; and thereby endeavour the preservation of our Common Liberty.

We therefore earnestly intreat you, as you regard the religious liberty of the present and future Generations, to communicate this letter, to some of the leading members of your Congregation; to use your interest and urge them to use theirs to get as many leading men of the various Non-episcopal Denominations among you as they shall think proper, to erect a similar society, or societies. Let us therefore, Notwithstanding our peculiar religious distinctions, heartily unite for our common Safety.

We who reside in this City and are thereby under superior Advantages of intelligence, will be as Vigilant as possible, in discovering any measures that may be pursued Detrimental to our Liberty; and give you such information as we shall conceive Subservient to our common cause. We also propose to correspond with our Brethren in Scotland and Ireland, and with the Standing Committee of Dissenters in England, to engage them to favour the design. The latter may have it in their power to do us singular service.

As soon as your Societies are Instituted, we shall be glad to be informed of it, and have the names of their members transmitted to us with directions how to direct to them. Their Letters to us may be directed to \_\_\_\_\_ Esq. in New York, and sent to us by some safe private hand to save postage, Except on Extraordinary Occasions. We enclose you a Copy of the Articles on which our Society is founded with the names of the members, that you may form yours on the like plan. We would only mention, that the sooner your Societies are formed the sooner we shall be enabled to open our Correspondence, and begin to experience the Salutary effects expected from their institution. We shall from time to time open to them the particular instances in which they may be more peculiarly Serviceable to the Common interest. We Cannot conclude without recommending it to the members of the Societies, to make it a matter of their prayer, that God would bless the design so far as it may tend to promote his Glory and the Good of his people.

We are, with esteem,

P. S. We would inform you that a number of us have lately had reprinted a small treatise written more [than] one hundred years ago, by Thomas Delaune entitled, A plea for the Nonconformists; sold by Gar-

rat Noel Bookseller in New York at the small price of 1s. 6d. in which the reasons and Grounds of our nonconformity are fully, clearly, and we think unanswerably stated ; and we would recommend it to your society to get a number of them to lend to their Neighbors and Acquaintance, and thereby make them as diffusively useful as possible ; as we think they will have a Good Tendency to Ground and fix them in their principles.

Ordered that a Number of Copies of the said Letter be engrossed before the next Meeting of the Society.

Mr. Moderator appoints Tuesday the 21<sup>st</sup> Instant for the next meeting of this Society at this House of David Phillips at six of the Clock in the evening.

And Lastly Mr. Peter R. Livingston is elected Moderator for the next Meeting of this Society.

At a meeting of the Society according to appointment of the Moderator at the House of David Phillips the 21<sup>st</sup> March 1769.

Present PETER R. LIVINGSTON Moderator.

Messrs. SAMUEL LOUDON	WILLIAM LIVINGSTON
ALEXANDER McDougall	JOHN BROOME
PETER V. B. LIVINGSTON	BENJAMIN Y. PRIME
HENRY WILLIAMS	ALEXANDER ROBERTSON
SAMUEL BROOME	JOSEPH HOLLETT
WILLIAM GOFORTH	
JONATHAN BLAKE	
WILLIAM M'KINLEY and	
JOHN M'KESSON	

Pursuant to the 11<sup>th</sup> general Rule the Minutes of the last preceding Meeting were read.

A Majority of the Members of this Society who belong to the Presbyterian Church under the pastoral charge of the Revd. Messrs. Rodgers and Treat being present to wit Mr. Moderator Messrs. Peter V. B. Livingston Samuel Broome William Livingston John Broome, Benjamin Y. Prime, Joseph Hollett Alexander McDougall and John McKesson do nominate Doctor Malachi Treat a Gentleman belonging to their particular Church and present him to this Society to be a Member thereof and he is unanimously received accordingly.

Messrs. William McKinley and John Broome introduce Alexander Lime Esq. of Sommerset County in New Jersey as a visiting Friend. The Society receives him accordingly and thanks him for his attendance.

Several Copies of the circular Letter of Correspondence being engrossed and signed brought into the Society were corrected, but there not being a Sufficient Number ordered that Committee of Correspondence do meet here on next Tuesday afternoon at three of the Clock to correct such other engrossed Copies of the said Letter and of the plan of this Society as shall then be ready.

Mr. Moderator appoints next Tuesday Evening for the next meeting of this Society at this House of David Phillips at six of the Clock.

And Lastly Doctor Benj. Y. Prime is unanimously elected Moderator for the next Meeting of this Society.

*2. Miranda and the British Admiralty, 1804-1806.*

In a former volume<sup>1</sup> we printed a group of papers which illustrated Miranda's expedition of 1806 from the point of view of one of the minor participants and victims, a young American who was among those captured off Porto Cabello and imprisoned at Cartagena. The papers now printed, obtained from the Public Record Office at London through the kindness of Mr. Hubert Hall, F.S.A., illustrate the same episode from another and a very interesting point of view, that of the British Admiralty. They are derived from the series of despatches sent to the Secretary of the Admiralty, William Marsden, by the admirals and other commanders on the North America, Jamaica and Leeward Islands stations, and that of the Cape of Good Hope, which at that time was generally understood to include the southeastern coasts of South America.<sup>2</sup> Those numbered II. to XIX., despatches and enclosures, including letters of Miranda, exhibit with great fullness and clearness the relations which the various British naval officers in American waters bore to his projects, the extent to which they aided him, and, indirectly, the attitude of the Lords of the Admiralty toward his designs. The chief documents hitherto printed illustrating this aspect of the episode are Admiral Cochrane's letter of June 9, 1806, addressed to Miranda,<sup>3</sup> and the memorandum issued in July by Governor Hislop of Trinidad.<sup>4</sup>

The document numbered I. has a special interest. It is a memorandum drawn up by Captain, afterward Rear-Admiral, Sir Home Popham, after a conference with Pitt and Melville in October, 1804, a few months before the outbreak of war with Spain. It casts light upon the mutual connection between the various schemes for the revolutionizing of Spanish America which the British government, for both political and economic reasons, from time to time entertained; and in particular upon the connection between the attacks which Miranda in Venezuela and Popham and Beresford at Buenos Ayres were almost simultaneously making.<sup>5</sup>

The thought of the emancipation of Spanish America had been suggested to the British mind by Governor Pownall in his *Memorial*

<sup>1</sup> III. 674-702. We have since learned that other portions of Henry Ingersoll's diary are possessed by the Boston Athenaeum. See *Third Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission*, A. H. A. 1898, p. 574.

<sup>2</sup> This was disputed; but see the *Report of the Trial of Sir Home Popham*, London, 1807, p. 102.

<sup>3</sup> Antepara, *South American Emancipation*, London, 1810, pp. 213-215.

<sup>4</sup> *Edinburgh Review*, January, 1809, XIII. 295.

<sup>5</sup> Also illustrated by Miranda's letter to the cabildo of Buenos Ayres, in Antepara, pp. 273, 274.

of 1780, and, according to John Adams,<sup>1</sup> in the *Crise de l'Europe* of 1783. Indeed, our readers may remember that it was intelligently expounded in a private memorial as early as June, 1741.<sup>2</sup> It was a thought to kindle the imagination, especially in times when the wealth of Spanish America was greatly exaggerated, and when the North American Revolution was fresh in mind. Miranda laid it before Pitt in 1790, at the time of the Nootka Sound difficulty. In 1804 it was definitely resolved upon, and Sir Home Popham was selected to command an expedition intended to execute it.<sup>3</sup> Melville, who had already examined the subject closely in 1796, conferred with Miranda. In October, Popham, in private conference with Pitt and Melville at Wimbledon, "remained the whole evening explaining all General Miranda's views," and was charged to see him again and "to draw up a specific memorial on that subject, and to explain the readiest way of embracing all the views which General Miranda had from time to time submitted to the government."<sup>4</sup> The memorial thus prepared is that now printed. When Popham, having in 1806 conquered the Cape of Good Hope and ultimately failed at Buenos Ayres, was tried in 1807 by a naval court-martial for having attempted the latter expedition without orders, he laid this memoir before the court for inspection as a part of the evidence in his justification, but on grounds of public policy submitted that it should not be read; and it was neither read aloud nor printed.<sup>5</sup>

I. MEMORANDUM BY CAPTAIN SIR HOME POPHAM.<sup>6</sup>

Sunday Oct 14<sup>th</sup> 1804

After the conference at Wimbledon<sup>7</sup> on Friday Night on the subject of South America, and the desire of Lord Melville<sup>8</sup> to have an interview with General Miranda on Tuesday, I thought it right to see the General for the purpose of obtaining such information as would enable me to state, in the concisest terms possible, the birth and education of General Miranda and his pursuits subsequent to his quitting the Spanish service, with

<sup>1</sup> *Diplomatic Correspondence of 1783-1789*, V. 123.

<sup>2</sup> *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, IV. 325-328.

<sup>3</sup> Report of his trial, p. 36.

<sup>4</sup> Testimony of Melville, *ibid.*, pp. 154-157.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 117, 219. See also Theal's *Records of Cape Colony*, V. 389-397.

<sup>6</sup> Admirals' Despatches, Cape of Good Hope, Vol. 5. Enclosure in Popham's despatch of April 30, 1806, from St. Helena to the Secretary of the Admiralty, which is printed in the *Report of the Trial of Sir Home Popham*, London, 1807, Appendix, Note B. Home Popham (1762-1820), afterward rear-admiral, was at this time commanding the *Antelope*, 50, on the Downs station.

<sup>7</sup> Conference with Pitt and Dundas. The latter's country residence was at Wimbledon, and near the house on Putney Heath which Pitt at this time occupied.

<sup>8</sup> Henry Dundas, Viscount Melville, first lord of the admiralty and an intimate friend of Pitt.

the progress he has made up to the present time in the great object which induced him to leave his own country, "The Emancipation of South America from its tyrannical Government it's oppressive administration, it's arbitrary exactions and the very exorbitant advances on all European articles." And here it may not be amiss to observe, that several partial revolts have taken place in the principal provinces, such as Lima, Caracas, Sante Fe etc., from the year 1780 to 1798; In the first instance they were compromised and the Government broke its faith, but latterly it has been obliged to propose terms of accommodation and to suffer the most violent insurgents to remain unnoticed, which is the strongest picture of the state of the whole country with respect to Spain.

General Miranda was born at Caraccas and is one of the first family's in that country. He received a classical and military education, and in compliment to his family, the King gave him at once a captain's commission in the army; he was then made Aid-de-camp to the Governor-General,<sup>1</sup> and Secretary to the Government of Havannah, in which situation he remained during the American War; here he first received representations from the aggrieved provinces, which at last terminated in specific propositions; to these he did not pay the least attention, in consequence of his publick employment, but quitting the Spanish Service at the conclusion of the War, he on account of some family disputes went to America<sup>2</sup> when the provinces of Santa Fe and Caracca renewed their addresses to him, and he laid the whole before General's Washington Knox and Hamilton, who promised him every assistance and gave him assurances of raising troops in the province of New England, provided he could persuade Great Britain to assist with her navy.

In 1785 Miranda came to Europe and seeing that England had but just emerged from a long war, he travelled over the continent remaining a certain time in Berlin<sup>3</sup> and all the high military schools, studying not only every military principle, but the principles of every Government where he resided. In Russia he had several audiences with the Empress Catherine and communicated to her his views in visiting Europe, with which she was highly pleased and gave him every protection by circular letters to her ambassadors<sup>4</sup> for the purpose of carrying into effect his philanthropick plan. In 90 he came to England and submitted it to M<sup>r</sup> Pitt who he says promised him every support in case of a war with Spain, but the dispute about Nootka Sound terminating amicably, he then went to Paris, in consequence of some letters he had received from the South Americans residing there; assuring him that France was well disposed to

<sup>1</sup> See the letters of Governor-General Cagigal to Rendon, Miranda and Washington, May 18, 26, 1783, in Antepara, *South American Emancipation*, pp. 251-254, and those of A. Gillon in Sparks, *Diplomatic Correspondence of 1783-1789*, VI. 333, 334, 353, 355.

<sup>2</sup> Marbois, *History of Louisiana*, pp. 149-150, assigns a political reason, derived from contemporary conversation with Miranda at Philadelphia.

<sup>3</sup> Correspondence of Miranda and Frederic, September 1785, in Antepara, pp. 42, 43.

<sup>4</sup> Printed in Antepara, pp. 41, 42.

countenance his project ;<sup>1</sup> and during his negotiation France was attacked by the Allied Armies and he was solicitous to enter into her service, which he did conditionally for one campaign. At the expiration of it he was appointed Governor and Captain General of S<sup>t</sup> Domingo with an army of 12,000 and an adequate fleet for the purpose of co-operating in his enterprise in favour of South America ;<sup>2</sup> just at this time however the principles of the French Government under which Miranda first engaged having materially altered, and growing every day worse and worse he hesitated to undertake this expedition and during the time of his suspense he fore-saw that Spain must be inevitably engaged in the War, and he sent Caro<sup>3</sup> and Narigno the two last emissaries that had arrived from South America to London, whither he soon followed them, and immediately renewed his proposition to the British Government, and although he had reason to expect from the assurances he received, that something would be done, especially as M<sup>r</sup> King the American minister was taken into the consideration,<sup>4</sup> and had several conferences with Lord Grenville, yet he was so pressed with letters from South America, that in 1801 he went again to France when he was so disgusted with Bonaparte that he returned to England in 1802 and brought with him two of the latest arrived South American Commissioners, and sent the rest to South America, with the strictest injunctions to his countrymen to remain quiet till some favourable event happened of which he could profit either by the assistance of Great Britain or America as they were the only two countries on which he placed any reliance.

On his arrival in London the British Government offered him immediate aid for the execution of his plan, the articles necessary were purchased and a ship named to carry him out, but at this moment the preliminary Articles of Peace were signed and this enterprise then lay dormant. The Government however offered him fair and honorable means of subsistence, not only for himself but for his countrymen who were in England ; and above all a promise of support whenever an opportunity occurred : this intelligence he sent to South America ; and to his countrymen in Philadelphia ; and he repeated his advice to them to remain quiet and not to encourage any premature measure of revolt.

Since the present war he has had various communications with His Majesty's Ministers and he pressed for permission to accompany M<sup>r</sup> King to America, but it was not granted and M<sup>r</sup> Vansittart<sup>5</sup> assured him in the name of the Government, that although the moment was not yet arrived

<sup>1</sup> See Sorel, *L'Europe et la Révolution Française*, III. 157, 175, as to Brissot, Lebrun and Dumouriez.

<sup>2</sup> Brissot's letter of November 28, 1792, to Dumouriez, *Edinburgh Review*, XIII. 288, Antepara, p. 169, shows that the ministers agreed that this appointment should be made, if Dumouriez would let Miranda go ; but it does not appear that it was made.

<sup>3</sup> For Don Pedro Josef Caro, see Miranda's letters of March 24 and August 17, 1798, to John Adams, in Adams's *Works*, VIII. 569, 581.

<sup>4</sup> See King's *Rufus King*, II. 649-666.

<sup>5</sup> Nicholas Vansittart, Secretary of the Treasury from March 1801 to April 1804. The British Museum has an extensive correspondence between him and Miranda.

for him to act yet he might send to Trinidad and assure his friends that when it did happen he should have the most liberal co-operation that England could give. I was present at many of his communications with the late administration,<sup>1</sup> and particularly consulted by M<sup>r</sup> Secretary Yorke<sup>2</sup> and just before the change took place a great proportion of the articles which he required were prepared and a ship ordered to be purchased which order was as suddenly countermanded.

When the new Government was formed I sent all the papers I had written on this subject since my first intimate connexion with General Miranda to Lord Melville, and I shall now trouble him with two propositions, the first a military one on a respectable scale comprehending all the points of descent in the pacifick, the Southern Atlantick, and Terra Firma from Asia to Europe; and the other on a more limited footing, dependant on circumstances which can only be decided by the particular disposition of His Majesty's Ministers and the nicety of their feelings reciprocally weighed with the conduct of the French Government on the scale of analogy which any countenance or assistance on our part will bear with the conduct of Spain, when she entered into a compact with France to aid our colonies in establishing their independance; previous and subsequent to this, she supplied the Americans with money from the Havanah, which was of more service to them in accomplishing their object, than all the troops and ships that France employed on this service.

In entering upon the subject of South America it is scarce necessary to call the attention of His Majesty's Ministers to its positive wealth, or its commercial faculties, they have been I am persuaded contemplated over and over again, and a universal anxiety has prevailed to turn this never-failing source of wealth into any channel but the one which at present enjoys it; and I may without any exaggerated calculation suppose that in specie and produce near twenty million sterling is imported into Spain, and two thirds of that at least carried into France, consequently under the peculiar situation that Spain is with respect to that country, she is very little better than the intermediate agent of her own colonies 'till Bonaparte is prepared to offer some political plea for sending an army to Vera Cruz for the purpose of gaining possession of the rich province of Mexico, and putting an effectual stop to any expedition from the United States. If at the same time he can manage either by secret negotiation or particular exertion to throw a force into the Brazils and to this may I presume to add the possibility of a third point, Rio de la Plata, from the Cape of Good Hope or the Mauritius, especially as the force which he has in the East Indies<sup>3</sup> can no longer act with any degree of spirit there, and may be recovered from it's panick by a little exertion in a friendly port, If such an operation should ever be realized, the enemy will be in possession of the East, Southeast and N. W. points of that Great Continent of South America (if I may be allowed to call all the

<sup>1</sup> That of Addington.

<sup>2</sup> Charles Yorke, secretary for war 1801-1803, home secretary 1803-1804.

<sup>3</sup> The force under Decaen, which had retired from India to Mauritius and Réunion. See Professor Sloane's article in this REVIEW, IV. 442.

Spanish possessions South America, because in a Geographical Division the line between North and South is drawn I believe across the Isthmus of Darien). Having explained according to my conception what it is possible for France to do let us now examine whether we have it in our power to avert so fatal a calamity, let us see what are our means direct and indirect, how we are to apply them and whether the objects to be obtained are equal to the risk and trouble of attaining them. The idea of conquering South America is totally out of the question, but the possibility of gaining all its prominent points, alienating it from its present European connexions, fixing on some military position and enjoying all its commercial advantages can be reduced to a fair calculation, if not a certain operation ; the nerve and spirit which such an enterprize would give to this country if successful are incalculable, the riches that it would bring in, the new sources that it would open for our manufactures and navigation both from Europe and Terra firma, and from Asia to the Pacifick are equally incalculable and the popularity and stability that it would give any Government that undertook it may be estimated from the preceding propositions with the additional satisfaction of knowing that some accounts must be received of the result of its first operation in three months after it sailed from England.

In offering my opinion as to the best points of descent, I beg it may be understood, that they have been previously submitted to General Miranda, and met his fullest approbation. First, Trinidad as a rendezvous for all the operations on Terra Firma between the River Oronoque and Santa Martha which is a little to the Eastward of Carthagina. And here let me observe that the province of Sante Fe de Bogota and the Caracca's on which the General rests his greatest Faith may with their influence be considered to contain all that tract of country from Oronoque West to the Pacific Ocean, about 350 leagues and certainly from the latitude of 11° N to the Line. this will include also Province of Quito which is guided by the same principles as the Caracca's and Santa Fe. . . Our dependance on the disposition of these provinces must rest on the faith we have in the correspondence which has been communicated by General Miranda ; I have had a most confidential intercourse with him for some time, and I think his letters and papers are in such a fair and regular succession that no doubt can exist of the fact and as most of the original letters have been shown or transmitted to some part of His Majesty's Government, I shall only insert an extract of a letter from Trinidad, as I am now on the subject of that island, under date the 20<sup>th</sup> of July last from M<sup>r</sup> Lambert a resident merchant and planter there.

" It appears the ramifications of the project are extended beyond what can be imagined, and so much so that many leading characters have no connexion with others who are employed in the same plans at very remote places from each other so that upon the whole nothing seems to be wanted but a chief, and place de ralliement."

This account was confirmed by M<sup>r</sup> Fitzwilliam a merchant who is just arrived from that place and has had the Honor of seeing Lord Melville,

but he adds that the partizans of this cause in the Island are considerably alarmed at the possible result of a mission sent to the Black Colony of St Domingo, they pray for the protection of the British Government which in either case of war or peace will ensure a most beneficial commercial intercourse with the River Oronoque and the neighbouring continent and make the island one of the first possessions in the Western Hemisphere.<sup>1</sup>

The mission to which I allude may have been urged probably by some of the emigrants from St Domingo resident at the Caraccas, on the depending societies pressing the activity of their countrymen to espouse so good a cause, and stating in stronger colours than it can possibly deserve, the apathy and disinclination of their European Friends.

The force which General Miranda thinks fully sufficient is two thousand infantry two corps of dismounted cavalry, two companies of artillery with permission to raise as many free corps as there are emigrant officers to embody at Trinidad, yet he only asks this force to be at his disposition, not intending to withdraw it from the island but in such proportion as may be found absolutely necessary. I cannot however resist pressing the policy of having such a force; as it may be proper to establish a permanent English garrison at Caracca or some other place on the coast. The Naval Force to be specifically nominated for this operation should be one 64. or 74. one 50. one frigate, one Sloop of War, two bombs, three gun brigs, two cutters, and three coppered transports, these may carry out the troops to Barbadoes, from whence seasoned troops should be removed to Trinidad—they will also carry out all the stores necessary for this expedition, a list of which has already been submitted by Miranda to Lord Melville. The Naval Force may be curtailed if His Lordship cannot spare it, but with what I have mentioned, there can be no doubt of succeeding in every point of view; provided always that our expectations of assistance from the Inhabitants are realized. I do not think it an object that the whole of this force should sail until there is a moral certainty of war; at least till the Cabinet decides that war shall take place at a given time, but it really is an object of the last importance that Miranda should quit this country without a moment's loss of time; his arrival at Trinidad in the simple character of a settler would give new life and spirit to the principal people in the country and shake in proportion the existing Government of Spain, it would also set aside the doctrine of the French emigrants who have instigated this mission to St Domingo and prove by his presence that Great Britain waited only a proper opportunity to give him her countenance and to act in a manner consistent with the policy of the times, and the existing relations between France and Spain.

Before I proceed any further in detail of operations, I shall ask a few simple questions. Is Spain independant of France? No! Is she virtually under the dominion and controul of that new Empire? Yes! Will France allow her to be on terms of peace with Great Britain one moment

<sup>1</sup> Trinidad had been lately acquired, in 1797.

longer than it is consistent with the views and projects of Bonaparte? No! Does France draw any revenue from South America through Spain? Yes: very great. Would it not materially distress France to cut off that source of wealth? Yes! Would it not considerably benefit Great Britain to throw that source into her scale, and open new channels for the export of her European and Asiatic manufactures? Yes! What supports the Spanish navy with which they are in some respects now bullying us? The treasures and timber of South America and the nursery which that foreign commerce holds out for her seamen. I therefore ask whether the independence of South America will not annihilate the Spanish navy and consequently oppose to us a less confederate force in any future war; If I may be allowed this argument then I can assert that the third naval power in Europe will be destroyed, and that power will consider the injury to have originated with France, against whom she will in course take any opportunity of being revenged that may present itself, in the extraordinary fluctuation of European politicks.

If I may credit the assertion of M<sup>r</sup> King the late American Minister, the emancipation of South America in general terms has been acknowledged by some of the leading men in opposition as a measure of extreme policy, and Lord Granville [Grenville] declared to him in the most qualified [unqualified] terms, that he thought it the greatest object for this country to attend to, and almost the only one to *save her*. This may be a strong expression but it shows that the subject has undergone a great deal of discussion and that nothing has been publickly urged against the policy or expediency of undertaking it on a dignified and extended scale.

I will not enlarge any more either on the advantages to be gained by this Expedition, or the extreme popularity that will attach to it, but confine myself to the intended progress from Trinidad and then notice the other points of descent.

The first operation from Trinidad must depend on two things, local information which must be received on the spot and the force disposable for this service. Miranda has been obliged to change his plan of operations several times, but at present he considers the possession of Leon de Caracca's,<sup>1</sup> as the first point, which will ensure the Port of La Guyra, and if there is any faith to be placed either in his intelligence or expectation, he will in the course of a month be able to raise an army of twenty thousand men, daily increasing especially as he advances into the country which is his present intention, fixing on stations of communication and intercourse with the Squadron. If the provinces of Caracca and Sante Fe,<sup>2</sup> give him that protection and assistance which he expects he will proceed by the most convenient preconcerted routes to the Isthmus of Darien, and the squadron or a proportion of it with such force as may be embarked from Jamaica will go on to the River Chagra where the Eng-

<sup>1</sup> Santiago de Leon de Caracas, now commonly called Caracas.

<sup>2</sup> E. c., the captain-generalcy of Venezuela and the viceroyalty of New Granada, whose capital was Santa Fe de Bogota.

lish adventurers landed many years ago,<sup>1</sup> and if the spirit of independence is as active as it is now calculated to be then all the future intercourse will be carried on by Jamaica. It is proposed that this island should send a small force to Santa Martha consisting probably of one thousand men; it is not however the intention of Miranda to take the least notice of Carthagina, Porto Bello, or any of the fortified towns on the coast, as they are in general unhealthy, but means will be adopted to cut off their supplies by the exertion of the people of the country.

The next point from Europe must certainly be Buenos Ayres, and to accomplish this object it will be necessary to have a force of three thousand men, because it must be considered that it is really a military operation to which however some facilities may be given by engaging two or three of the South Americans to attend the Expedition, by way of explaining to their countrymen the great object of this undertaking. Then with respect to the Pacifick Ocean, I consider two points of descent as sufficient, one however might suffice but if the other can be accomplished it will have a great effect upon the people to the Southward of Buenos Ayres. I mean in speaking of this which is on the coast of Chili to propose Valpariso, and if the force for that object could either be concentrated at, or taken from New South Wales, by new levies or otherwise, it would make this proposition perfect. The great force however for the Pacifick which I will propose to come from India and to consist of 4000 Sepoys and a small proportion of Europeans should direct its course to Panama, which is fixed upon as the point of concentration for all our forces, and from this point with the assistance of the ships from India and the Spanish ships that we can procure in the South Sea, communications will be immediately made all along the coast to the Southward as far as Lima, and means of assistance given to the country to establish itself in all the positions which may be thought worthy of attention.

On the first view this may appear a very complex undertaking, but I think it may be simplified and brought into a very narrow compass, and certainly the principal point which is Trinidad attended to without the least suspicion. The three regiments may sail from Ireland for the West Indies. The ship to carry out the General and whoever may be Governor of Trinidad and Commanding Officer of the Navy, rendezvous at Cowes, fitted for foreign service, and if she has an acting captain the whole may be done with the greatest secrecy and Miranda embark for [from] Lymington. An arrangement must be made about the Royal treasures which I think ought to go to the Crown for the expence of the equipment, this however and a variety of other details may be entered into when it is determined to undertake the great national object. And if one confidential person of Government is fixed on to make all the arrangements, with power to apply to each of the officers, I pledge myself that the whole on the most extended scale, shall be ready to sail in fourteen days. If however any reasons of moment should be urged against this plan superior to the probable advantages already described of

<sup>1</sup> At the end of 1670, when Morgan's men took Chagre on their way to Panama.

ultimately annihilating one fleet, of cutting off fifteen millions from the Revenue of France, and probably adding it to our own, and raising in that proportion our consequence in Europe. Then I submit the propriety of taking up without a moment's loss of time the consideration of Trinidad as a colony, a naval station, a military and commercial position with respect to Oronoque and the Caracca's. And then send Miranda there, and ascertain the countenance or assistance that it will be expedient to give him personally, for I think no more imputation can attach to any moveable protection than does already by keeping him here for this specifick purpose, to apply him and his resources, whenever it shall be considered that this country is politically justified in doing so.

II. WILLIAM ARMSTRONG TO CAPTAIN EDWARD MOORE.<sup>1</sup>

*Leander*, Lat. 28, 12<sup>th</sup> Feb. 1806

My dear Moore,

I wrote you twice lately from New York from whence I sailed on the 2<sup>nd</sup> inst. informing you of my having engaged in a spec in which I wished you to take a part.

Having just fallen in with the Cleopatra I embrace the opportunity of saying I am now on my way with a number of very good fellows to put it in execution and provided we meet with no unexpected interruption have little doubt of success. If therefore you wish to put yourself in fortune's way come to me as soon as possible, I shall keep the situation I mentioned vacant for you and you may rest assured nothing in my power (which is not trifling) shall be left undone to serve you.

If you come get to Barbadoes or Trinidad as soon as possible; at the first you will hear of me from Phill Amiel [?] to be found at Condors, the other from W<sup>m</sup>. M. or Lambeth.

I will thank you to write to M<sup>w</sup> A and inform her we are all well and desire her to communicate it to S. and all my friends.

If the Admiral or Capt Beresford is with you remember me to them, tell the last I saw G. R. very well the day I embarked. You will probably meet W<sup>m</sup> A. T. remember me to all friends with you and believe me unalterably yours.

W. A.

All friends at New York were well excepting J. C. P. who is on his last legs.

Capt. Edw. Moore  
Bermuda

<sup>1</sup> Admirals' Despatches, North America, Vol. 17. Probably an enclosure in Captain Wight's letter, No. iv., post. The writer was no doubt William Armstrong, a half-pay captain of the British army whom Miranda made "colonel of the first regiment of riflemen in the Columbian army" and his quartermaster-general. See Biggs, *History of Don Francisco de Miranda's Attempt*, Boston, 1810, pp. 17, 19, 237, 238, 245.

III. MIRANDA TO ADMIRAL SIR A. MITCHELL.<sup>1</sup>

à bord la *Cleopatre* ce 13 février 1806.

*Monsieur l'Amiral,*

Un accident nous ayant fait renconter la Cleopatre dans notre route de New York aux cotes de l'Amerique Meridionale ; je me suis trouvé sous la nécessité de lui communiquer des affaires secrètes et de la plus haute importance ; que nous sommes sur le point de mettre à execu-tion avec la connoissance et assentiment tacite du Gouvernement de la Grande Bretagne—and c'est par la manifestation des documens que j'ai avec moi qu'a Captain Wight a bien voulu consentir à nous laisser pour-suivre cet important objet. j'espere que cette communication indispensable restera entre lui et vous dans un secret inviolable pour le present ; et que s'il etait compatible avec vos instructions de le laisser venir le Captain Wight avec sa fregate pour cooperer par la suite, cela seroit aussi important pour votre Pay qu'agreable et satisfaisant au mien.

Je suis avec grande consideration Monsieur l'Amiral, votre très hum-ble et tres obt. servt.

FRAN. DE MIRANDA.

Amiral Sir A. Michel K. B.

TRANSLATION OF THE PRECEDING.<sup>2</sup>

*Sir*

Having by accident fallen in with the Cleopatra in our way from New York to the coast of South America, I found myself under the necessity of communicating to her secret affairs of the highest importance which we are upon the point of transacting with the knowledge and consent of the Government of Great Britain. Captain Wight in consequence of the manifestation of documents which I have with me has thought proper to allow us to pursue our voyage on this important business.

I hope Sir, that this unavoidable communication will remain an inviolable secret between you and him ; and if it be consistent with your instructions to send Capt. Wight with his frigate to cooperate with us in the end ; it will prove equally important to your country as agreeable and satisfactory to mine.

I am with the greatest consideration Sir  
Your very obedient humble servant

FRA<sup>o</sup>. DE MIRANDA.

<sup>1</sup> Admirals' Despatches, North America, Vol. 17. Apparently an enclosure in Captain Wight's letter, No. IV., post. Admiral Sir Andrew Mitchell had been commander-in-chief on the North American station since 1802. He died at Bermuda on February 26, 1806.

<sup>2</sup> Also apparently an enclosure in Captain Wight's letter.

IV. CAPTAIN JOHN WIGHT TO CAPTAIN JOHN POO BERESFORD.<sup>1</sup>*Sir*

His Majesty's ship under my command on a cruize to the Southward of the Island of Bermuda on the 19<sup>th</sup> January 1806<sup>2</sup> fell in with a vessel called the Leander under American colours with about 220 men on board, and mounted with twenty guns, cleared out for Jaquemelle Island of S<sup>t</sup> Domingo in possession of the blacks, having as a cargo, thirty pieces of cannon some thousand pikes, pistols, cutlasses, saddles, and all other sorts of warlike implements, printers, and printing presses the whole under the direction of General Miranda and a Major Armstrong of Col. Williamson's corps.<sup>3</sup>

As there may many doubts arise respecting the real destination of this vessel, I beg to acquaint you that I examined Miranda very closely and that he produced me letters, from Alexander Davidson, Esq. of S<sup>t</sup> James Square whose signature I knew who had mentioned his project to Sir Evan Nepean,<sup>4</sup> Sir Home Popham, M<sup>r</sup>. Vansitart, and that the said project was in the confidence of His Majesty's Minister, the Right Honble. William Pitt and that M<sup>r</sup>. Vansitart's note to Miranda particularly mentioned his conference with the minister on this subject advising Miranda to make his point of attack from the United States. Miranda also produced me his proclamation in the Spanish tongue,<sup>5</sup> which he was to present to the inhabitants of New Spain also their constitution [which?] as he said had undergone considerable alteration by the Ministers own hand. he also stated to me that he left England with about six thousand pounds and he produced me copies of bills drawn since his arrival at New York for the four different sums of five hundred pounds each on M<sup>r</sup>. Vansitart, and from the private conversation of the General and myself he fully appeared to me to be a person in the confidence of the Ministry. I did deliberately consider the same and permitted the said vessel, troops, cannon, pikes, and men to pass unmolested, to proceed to Jaquemell and from thence to Laquira [La Guaira] under the auspices of Miranda to revolutionize that district and the Caraccas under a promise to me that on the event of his success the ports of that country should be open to the commerce of Great Britain, from whence he had drawn his present sources of money.

<sup>1</sup> Admirals' Despatches, North America, Vol. 17; enclosure in Beresford's despatch of March 5, No. v., post. Captain Beresford, afterward admiral, acted as senior officer on the North American station after the death of Admiral Mitchell.

<sup>2</sup> February 12 according to the preceding letters, Biggs, pp. 10-13, and Henry Ingersoll in this REVIEW, III. 679. The *Leander* did not sail from New York till February 2.

<sup>3</sup> The corps which Colonel Adam Williamson, governor of Jamaica, formed for service in Santo Domingo.

<sup>4</sup> Alexander Davison was a well-known government contractor, the prize-agent and confidential friend of Nelson, but convicted of peculation in 1807. Sir Evan Nepean was from 1804 to 1806 one of the lords of the admiralty.

<sup>5</sup> Antepara, pp. 202-205; John H. Sherman, *General Account of Miranda's Expedition*, pp. 35-39; Biggs, pp. 125-131; *Adventures and Sufferings of Moses Smith*, Brooklyn, 1812, p. 22.

So great a consideration as this wherein I judged the distresses of the enemy would be enormous and that the benefit arising to Great Britain so incalculable I did take upon myself although she had no commission or pass to permit her to proceed on the policy of the measure, that however much I might suffer from not making a capture of her, yet as a servant of the crown I conceived it my duty not to make any exposition of this secret nature before any Court of Admiralty. I have but to request you will be pleased to make a communication to His Majesty's ministers of this subject, that I might know whether my transactions are such as they will approve of, I also enclose you the General's letters requesting assistance.

I have the honor to be Sir  
Your most obedient humble  
servant

JOHN WIGHT

John Poo Beresford Esq.  
Commander in Chief of his Majesty's Ships and Vessels.

v. CAPTAIN BERESFORD TO THE SECRETARY.<sup>1</sup>

*Cambrian*, BERMUDA,  
5<sup>th</sup> March 1806.

Sir

I think it my duty to forward the enclosed statement from Captain Wight of His Majesty's Ship Cleopatra, for the information of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty.

The Leander has evaded the cruizers of this squadron, ever since the war began, and has continually taken gun powder and warlike stores to the enemy,<sup>2</sup> and returned to New York with colonial produce, and it appears to me in this instance they have outwitted Captain Wight for M<sup>r</sup> Vansittart has been long out of office,<sup>3</sup> and at that time M<sup>r</sup> Pitt was not the Minister. I have looked over all the late Admiral's papers. I cannot find any communication from M<sup>r</sup> Merry<sup>4</sup> to the Admiral on the subject.

I have the honor to be Sir  
Your most obeient humble servant

J. P. BERESFORD.

W<sup>m</sup> Marsden Esq.  
Admiralty, London.

<sup>1</sup> Admirals' Despatches, North America, Vol. 17. William Marsden, the Orientalist, editor of Marco Polo, was first secretary to the admiralty from 1804 to 1807.

<sup>2</sup> See this confirmed in *The Trial of William S. Smith and Samuel G. Ogden*, New York, 1807, p. 253.

<sup>3</sup> Vansittart had left the treasury in April, 1804.

<sup>4</sup> British Minister at Washington.

VI. REAR-ADMIRAL SIR ALEXANDER COCHRANE TO THE SECRETARY.<sup>1</sup>

*Dolphin*, Carlisle Bay,  
BARBADOES, 12 April '06

Sir

Information has arrived from Trinidad that General Miranda with an expedition fitted out in America has made a descent on the Island of Margaritta where he was joined by about 3000 men and that he was on his way to attack Cumana and Barcelona.<sup>2</sup> The report also states there was every appearance that the Insurrection would be general.<sup>3</sup>

Being unacquainted with the nature of this Expedition I conceived it my duty to write him a letter of which the enclosed is a copy, and should it be the intention of Government to support him, the sooner I obtain instructions the better, as a little assistance at the beginning may render the Expedition successful.

I have the honor to be Sir  
Your most obedient  
humble servant  
ALEX. COCHRANE.

VII. CAPTAIN THOMAS JOHN COCHRANE TO REAR-ADMIRAL COCHRANE.<sup>4</sup>

Extract of a letter from Captain Cochrane of H. M. Ship Jason dated 23<sup>rd</sup> April 1806.

"Since writing to you from Trinidad, I have received no satisfactory information respecting General Miranda. At Cumana they seem in a most terrible fright for fear of his landing.<sup>5</sup> in fact Cagegal<sup>6</sup> told Lieut<sup>t</sup> Briarly the country never was in such a state before; he also said they had intelligence of this General being at S' Domingo taking on board a number of blacks to assist him.

"Whether there is any truth in it,<sup>7</sup> or whether he only does it to give us a bad idea of Miranda's designs I cannot say, but a few days must bring everything to light."

<sup>1</sup> Admirals' Despatches, Leeward Islands, Vol. 25. Endorsed as received June 2. Cochrane was commander-in-chief at the Leeward Islands, with his flag on the *Norfolk*.

<sup>2</sup> This information was erroneous. Miranda's expedition had at this time just reached Aruba. Biggs, p. 55.

<sup>3</sup> Regarding this, an important point in estimating the expedition, see letter of Lieutenant J. Murray, November 6, 1807, in the *Monthly Review* for March 1809, LVIII. 307, 308; Lieutenant Briarly's letter of May 2, 1806, No. viii., post; and Marshall's *Naval Biography*, X. 407.

<sup>4</sup> Enclosure in Rear-Admiral Cochrane's despatch of May 8; see No ix., post. The writer was the admiral's son.

<sup>5</sup> See the intercepted letters printed in Biggs, pp. 239-241, and in Sherman's *General Account of Miranda's Expedition*, p. 41; also Briarly's letter of May 2, No. viii., post.

<sup>6</sup> "Governor" (footnote in the manuscript).

<sup>7</sup> Miranda seems to have enlisted no blacks at Jacmel.

VIII. LIEUTENANT BRIARLY TO REAR-ADMIRAL COCHRANE.<sup>1</sup>

Extract of a letter from Lieut. Briarly dated 2<sup>nd</sup> May who was at Cumana on the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> of April in a flag of truce.

"The country is in a dreadful state, an embargo on every vessel on this coast, no person suffered to quit their dwelling on pain of death, every person under arms that are able to bear them, the prisons full of Miranda's friends and in short everything in the greatest confusion imaginable. In the meantime no person has any knowledge of the present situation of Miranda nor is it even conjectured in which part of the West Indies he is. this I am certain, he has a multitude of friends who will join him the moment he appears. I fear much delay will injure his plans."

IX. REAR-ADMIRAL SIR ALEXANDER COCHRANE TO THE SECRETARY.<sup>2</sup>

*Dolphin*, Carlisle Bay,

BARBADOES, 8th May 1806

Sir,

I have the honor to enclose extracts of two letters which I this day received<sup>3</sup> respecting General Miranda by which it appears he has not yet landed on the Spanish Main, though he is evidently expected there shortly, as they are under a general alarm, and seem to be much on the alert; I cannot learn where he is at Present.

The Canada, Ettalion and Circe arrived here this morning but were not fortunate enough to fall in with the four French frigates that arrived in those seas lately and I then understood were at Guadeloupe, but Captain Harvey (of the Canada) informs me he has passed round Martinique and Guadeloupe and ascertained that they are not at either of those islands, he has also called at Antigua and St. Kitts and could obtain no intelligence of them whatever, I therefore conclude they have stood on to the Northward to endeavor to intercept our homeward bound trade.

I have the honor to be Sir

Your most obedient humble servant

ALEX. COCHRANE

X. CAPTAIN DONALD CAMPBELL TO REAR-ADMIRAL COCHRANE.<sup>4</sup>

His Majesty's Sloop "*Lilly*"

N. P. Barbadoes S. E. by S. Dist 65 Miles, 4<sup>th</sup> June 1806.

Sir,

I have the honor to inform you on the 26<sup>th</sup> day of May when in sight of Grenada I fell in with the American Ship Leander having on

<sup>1</sup> Enclosure in Cochrane's despatch of May 8; No. IX., *post*.

<sup>2</sup> Admiral's Despatches, Leeward Islands, Vol. 25. Endorsed as received June 20.

<sup>3</sup> See *ante*, Nos. VII. and VIII., of April 23 and May.

<sup>4</sup> Copy. Enclosed in Rear-Admiral Cochrane's despatch of June 6; see *post*, No. XI. For Captain Donald Campbell and his services to the expedition, see Marshall, *Naval Biography*, X. 399-413, where letters of Miranda and others are printed.

board General Miranda and loaded with pieces of ordnance and military stores; from his having on board but one cask of water and being short of provisions I took him under convoy and after touching at Grenada and consulting with His Excellency General Maitland<sup>1</sup> and consistent with General Miranda's own wishes, I am now making the best of my way to Barbadoes with the Leander under convoy. General Miranda has made one unsuccessfull attempt to land on the coast of Caraccas to leeward of Port of Cavella where he unfortunately met a Spanish brig and schooner, Guada coasters.<sup>2</sup> they took two schooners he had in company having on board ordnance and military stores, and sixty of his most confidential officers and men.<sup>3</sup>

The Master of the Leander appears to me a perfect pirate in idea, the crew perfectly disatisfied and nearly in a state of mutiny, nor does there appear the smallest credit attached the Expedition.

The Leander mounts eighteen brass nine pounders and has now in all on board about one hundred persons. I chased the Leander thirty-six hours nor should I then have come up with her had the Lilly not been favoured by winds.

General Miranda has produced no document from the British or any other [government] authorizing his expedition. he acknowledges having been some weeks at Jacome S<sup>t</sup> Domingo where he appears to have been disappointed in his expectations of augmenting his force, there is not a native of that colony on board the Leander.

I have the honor to be Sir  
Your most obedient humble servant

D CAMPBELL.

xii. REAR-ADMIRAL SIR ALEXANDER COCHRANE TO THE SECRETARY.<sup>4</sup>

*Northumberland*, Carlisle Bay,  
BARBADOES, 6<sup>th</sup> June 1806.

Sir

I enclose for the consideration of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty copy of intelligence sent me by General Beckwith from S<sup>t</sup> Vincent, which adds to the authenticity of that enclosed in my letter no 147; and I do not think it improbable as they were steering N N W before they spoke the American vessel, that they may call at these islands in their way to Europe: a strong squadron is certainly expected by every intelligence I can collect, but whether it is the above-mentioned or that said to be fitting at Rochfort, I am yet unable to find out.

<sup>1</sup> Major-General Frederick Maitland, lieutenant-governor of Grenada.

<sup>2</sup> Guarda-costas.

<sup>3</sup> Their fortunes may be followed in the letters of Ingersoll, the narratives of Sherman and Moses Smith, and the anonymous account in the *Monthly Magazine* for March, 1809. After losing them, April 28, Miranda had made for Bonair, and then sailed about the eastern Caribbean; Biggs, 69-93.

<sup>4</sup> Admirals' Despatches, Leeward Islands, Vol. 25. Marked as received July 12.

I also enclose a copy of a letter I have this moment received from Captain Campbell of His Majesty's Sloop "Lilly"<sup>1</sup> by which it will appear General Miranda has been hitherto unsuccessful in his attempt on the Spanish main; as the Leander is now with the Lilly, I expect him here in a day or two<sup>2</sup> and I should be glad to receive their Lordships instructions respecting him.

I have the honor to be Sir, your most obed<sup>t</sup> hble. serv<sup>t</sup>,

ALEX. COCHRANE.

xii. REAR-ADmiral Sir ALEXANDER COCHRANE TO THE SECRETARY.<sup>3</sup>

*Northumberland, off Port Royal Bay,  
MARTINIQUE, 12 June 1806.*

Sir

Be pleased to inform the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty that previous to my leaving Barbadoes, General Miranda arrived in an armed ship under American colours, from an unsuccessful attempt he made to land near Porto Cavello in consequence of the Spanish Naval Force being superior to the vessels he sent in shore.

Conceiving every attempt to annoy the enemy as beneficial to Great Britain, I have agreed to protect his landing by a sloop of war and two armed brigs, and when the convoys are safe, with a frigate if I have one to spare; I have also directed the Commanders of those vessels, to receive on board as many of his recruits as they can carry.<sup>4</sup>

It is not yet determined where the descent is to be, but I suppose near to Cumana, unless it should be decided to begin with Angustura:<sup>5</sup> By accounts from the Continent many are ready to join him as soon as he makes good his landing.

I hope the measure I have adopted may be agreeable to their Lordships.

I have the honor to be Sir

Your most obed<sup>t</sup> humble servant

ALEX. COCHRANE.

<sup>1</sup> See the preceding, No. x.

<sup>2</sup> He arrived on the sixth.

<sup>3</sup> Admirals' Despatches, Leeward Islands, Vol. 25. Endorsed as received July 12.

<sup>4</sup> Cochrane's engagement to this effect, dated June 9, 1806, may be found in Antepara, pp. 213-215, with Miranda's reply. After the above stipulation, Cochrane adds: "I do moreover assure you of such further support as it may be in my power occasionally to give." But the article on the Emancipation of Spanish America in the *Edinburgh Review* for January 1809, an article which Copinger attributes to "Milner assisted by General Miranda," says, XIII. 295, that after a little time the admiral wrote to him, that "by recent instructions received from England, he was directed to limit the assistance General Miranda was to receive from him, to protection from the naval force of the enemy, to prevent succours being landed, and to secure his re-embarkation, in the event of his being obliged to leave the shore." That Fox, the new Foreign Secretary, was disposed to be cautious in support of Miranda is evident from his conversation with Monroe on June 7; see *Writings of James Monroe*, IV. 450.

<sup>5</sup> Santo Thomé de la Angostura, on the Orinoco; now Ciudad Bolívar.

XIII. MIRANDA TO VICE-ADMIRAL JAMES R. DACRES.<sup>1</sup>  
(Copy No. 2).

Sir,

CORO, 6<sup>th</sup> Aug. 1806.

We arrived at the Port of La Vela de Coro on the 1<sup>st</sup> inst. The landing that was to take place that night was by the mistake of the pilots deferred 'till the next day, and by the stress of weather unavoidably retarded until the 3<sup>rd</sup> at daylight.

These circumstances gave time to the agents of the Spanish Governments to collect all the forces they could command in the circumjacent country for the purpose of opposing us.

We effected it however, in spight of all their opposition, with the force of 100 men against 400, we stormed the fort of S<sup>t</sup> Peter and carried a redoubt just above it with a battery also on the shore in less than an hour's time. The enemy left us in absolute possession of the town, port, 200 pieces of artillery, ammunition etc.

The inhabitants soon came to us and having been informed of our friendly and patriotic intentions, filled the town with satisfaction, and many of the Indians that served with the enemy joined us with alacrity, in a few hours afterwards. With this force two hundred additional men, and two field pieces, we marched at 10 o'clock P.M. towards the City of Coro (12 miles from La Vela) and before daylight the next day we took possession of it without any resistance. The Commandant Solas with his troops fled towards the interior mountains and left us in quiet possession of the capital and principal port of the province. this operation only required 24 hours time.

The desire of showing confidence and friendship to the inhabitants may induce us in a short time to withdraw the troops from the town toward the sea shore for the purpose of keeping a regular communication with the navy, and following our operations in concert, towards Puerto Cavello, and Caraccas.

I cannot express the satisfaction I feel in seeing the zeal, harmony and good understanding, that has constantly prevailed between the troops and the navy officers during the whole time we have been with Captain Campbell. Those officers that superintended the landing of the troops, and the picquets of the navy under Lieut Bedingfield distinguished themselves as worthy members of that body.

I am with high respect and great consideration,

Sir,

Your most obedient, most humble servant

FRAN. DE MIRANDA

<sup>1</sup> Admirals' Despatches, Jamaica, Vol. 24. Enclosure in Dacres's letter of August 30 to the Secretary, No. xvii., post. Vice-Admiral Dacres was commander-in-chief on the Jamaica station. Toward the end of June Miranda and his British allies sailed from Barbadoes, toward the end of July from Trinidad to Coro. Other accounts of the actions at Coro may be found in Biggs, pp. 109-151, in a letter of Captain Donald Campbell printed in Marshall's *Naval Biography*, X. 404-405, and in a letter written from Aruba, August 23, by an officer in Miranda's corps to his brother in New York, and printed by Sherman, pp. 113-118.

xiv. MIRANDA TO VICE-ADMIRAL DACRES.<sup>1</sup>

Head Quarters, LA VELA DE CORO,  
8<sup>th</sup> August 1806.

*Sir,*

The object of this despatch is to inform you that we are in possession of this port, and of the greatest part of the Province of Coro. That we consider ourselves independent of Spain, and the friends of Great Britain; as you will see by the enclosed documents that I send to you for the purpose of giving a correct insight into the state of our connexions with the Government of England:—requesting you to keep them in the secrecy and privacy they ought to be.

Before I quitted England in September last with the idea of executing this enterprise, it was agreed with the late Ministry<sup>2</sup> that I was to acquaint you, as well as the Admiral Commanding on the Windward Station, with my landing on the Coasts of South America, [?] to free it from the disgraceful and oppressive yoke of France.

The chief support I want at the present moment is detailed in my enclosed private letter to Admiral Cochrane.

I hope that between you and the Governor of Jamaica we shall receive if not the whole at least part of the troops and naval assistance we are so much in want of at this present moment for the speedy success of this important enterprise.

We had the happiness of being assisted in our landing by the Bacchante Frigate, Capt. Dacres<sup>3</sup> and some of his crew; which incident contributed very much to our farther success, in taking possession of the City of Coro, the Metropolis of the Province.

I have the honour to be with high respect and consideration

Sir

Your most obed<sup>t</sup> and

most humble ser<sup>t</sup>

FRAN : DE MIRANDA.

xv. MIRANDA TO VICE-ADMIRAL DACRES.<sup>4</sup>

(Copy)

LA VELA DE CORO,  
8<sup>th</sup> Aug. 1806.

*My dear Admiral,*

After having been obliged to quit Trinidad on the 24<sup>th</sup> ult. with only the increase of 80 men volunteers in our troops, I could not attempt

<sup>1</sup> Admirals' Despatches, Jamaica, Vol. 24. Enclosure in Dacres's despatch of August 30 to the Secretary, No. XVII., *post*.

<sup>2</sup> That of Pitt, which had ended with his death on January 23, 1806, and had been succeeded by that of Grenville and Fox.

<sup>3</sup> James R. Dacres, son of the vice-admiral; see Biggs, pp. 114, 115, 154. He afterward commanded the *Guerrière* in her fight with the *Constitution*, in 1812.

<sup>4</sup> Admirals' Despatches, Jamaica, Vol. 24. Enclosure in Dacres's despatch of August 30 to the Secretary, No. XVII., *post*.

any fortified place on the coasts nor even the Island of Margarita with any probability of success: on that supposition we came to Coro where we have compleatly succeeded in the first instance and notwithstanding a concatenation of blunders in pilots and our raw land officers that is really unaccountable. The people of the country are very well disposed to join us in this enterprise for their own sake, but at the same time they are excessively shy, seeing that our troops are so few in number and that we may ultimately be driven out of the country, and leave them totally destitute of protection.

If I had with me only one regiment of Infantry, and one or two squadrons of cavalry with one company of Artillery, the whole might be settled in a few days and our success would be compleatly obtained. I have evacuated the town of Coro with the view of inspiring confidence to the inhabitants, and going back again if necessary after having received a reinforcement of troops.

In the secret correspondence that I intercepted at Coro, at the Commandant's House, I find in a letter dated 11<sup>th</sup> July 1806 the following intelligence.

"Via (?) abia noticia venida de Puerto Cavello por un barco procedente de Martinica que dicen ha llegado alli, notician que los Franceses han conquistado a Portugal cuio Reyno cede la Francia á nos ostros y en remplazo le damos esta Provincia."<sup>1</sup> If this information is true (which would not surprise me in the present circumstances) this province instead of belonging to us as was intended, will become a province of France, and the footstool for the invasion of the whole South American Continent. We have no time to lose, my dear Admiral, send me the reinforcements I mention to you in this letter and we shall be at Caraccas before the month expires.

I mean to hold on to this coast, and to keep some of the small ports, until I hear from you, and to direct my steps toward Puerto Cavello by the Sea Shore, in proportion as I shall receive reinforcements from you, from Jamaica or any where else: I am expecting to descry the Jason every moment or some other frigate that will give support to our gallant small squadron, with instructions that may enable the commanders to land a portion of their seamen, and support our efforts on shore, as Captain Campbell has so willingly and so usefully done.

Any side or fire arms are most necessarily wanted at this moment to give to the people that most anxiously demand them.

I am with the greatest respect and affection etc.

FRAN. DE MIRANDA.

<sup>1</sup> I. e., apparently, "—have news from Puerto Cabello by a bark said to have arrived there from Martinique, that the French have conquered Portugal, which country France cedes to us [Spain], and in return we give her this province [meaning, probably, the captain-generalship of Caracas].

xvi. VICE-ADMIRAL JAMES R. DACRES TO MIRANDA.<sup>1</sup>  
Copy.

His Britanic Majesty's Ship *Pique*,

PORT ROYAL, JAMAICA, August [24], 1806.

Sir,

I was on the 15<sup>th</sup> Inst. honoured with your letter of the 8<sup>th</sup> from Vela de Coro, with its enclosures, by your Aid de Camp Cap<sup>t</sup> Leslie.<sup>2</sup>

The force on this station being very considerably less than the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty are aware of, I do not feel myself justified in lessening it in support of an enterprise, of which I have not the slightest information from my Government, at the risque of neglecting the services required of the squadron I have the honor to command, which must be the case in rendering you the assistance you require.

I have hurried the equipment of a cruiser for Cap<sup>t</sup> Leslie's passage to Vela de Coro, and have ordered her commander to cruise on the coast of the Caraccas as much as possible to add to your security, while on the coast, from any attack that might be made by a junction of the Gua[r]da Coasters, or any inconsiderable force of the enemy.

I have the honor to be with high respect and consideration Sir

Your obedient humble servant

J. R. DACRES.

xvii. VICE-ADMIRAL JAMES R. DACRES TO THE SECRETARY.<sup>3</sup>

*Shark*, PORT ROYAL,<sup>4</sup> 30<sup>th</sup> August 1806

Sir

I have the honour to transmit herewith for the information of the Right Honorable the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, copies

<sup>1</sup> Admirals' Despatches, Jamaica, Vol. 24. Enclosure in Dacres's letter of August 30 to the Secretary, No. xvii., post. Biggs, p. 180, mentions the arrival of H. B. M. brig *Ferret* at Aruba on September 13, with this letter and a similar one from the governor of Jamaica.

<sup>2</sup> Biggs, pp. 48, 158, mentions James F. *Ledlie*, "captain in the First Regiment of (North American) infantry." *Ledlie* is also the name given in the *Annual Register* for 1806, pp. 317, 318.

<sup>3</sup> Admirals' Despatches, Jamaica, Vol. 24. Of the enclosures mentioned, the first is Rear-Admiral Cochrane's letter to Miranda, dated Barbadoes, June 9, in which he, in view of the nature of Miranda's plans and the favorable attention which the British has given them, agrees to support the latter's landing on the Main between Trinidad and Aruba with at least a sloop of war and two brigs, and to give other aid, expecting in return that the British (and the people of the United States if Miranda desires) shall be permitted, if independence is established, to import goods at the same rate of duty as natives, while the French and their allies are excluded, and other nations pay a rate ten per cent. higher. This document is here omitted, having been already printed in Antepara's *South American Emancipation*, pp. 213-215. The second enclosure, of the same date, is Miranda's acceptance of the terms, and is omitted for the same reason; see Antepara, p. 215. The other enclosures are, apparently, Miranda's letters dated Coro, August 6, and La Vela de Coro, August 8, and Dacres's reply of August [24], for all which see *ante*, Nos. XIII., XIV., XV. and XVI.

<sup>4</sup> Jamaica.

of a letter and several enclosures I received from General Miranda, on the *Raposa's* return from her cruize, also a copy of my answer, with which I despatched His Majesty's Sloop *Ferret* on the 24 inst.<sup>1</sup>

I am Sir

Your obed'. humble servant

JA. R. DACRES.

To William Marsden Esq.

XVIII. REAR-ADMIRAL SIR ALEXANDER COCHRANE TO THE SECRETARY.<sup>2</sup>

*Northumberland*, Carlisle Bay,

BARBADOES, 11<sup>th</sup> September 1806.

Sir,

I have to acquaint you for the information of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty with the return of His Majesty's Ships named in the margin to this anchorage on the 10<sup>th</sup> after having seen the convoy safe to the Latitude of Bermuda and left it about fifty leagues to the northward of that island on the 19<sup>th</sup> ultimo.

As a line of battleship, one frigat and a corvette were seen going into Fort Royal Bay, Martinique, about eight days ago, I have directed Captain Harvey of the Canada to take the Seine under his orders and proceed off that port.

The Elephant will leave this tomorrow for Jamaica; and I shall give Captain Dundas orders to call off Fort Royal and should the enemy's ships have left that bay, to take with him the Seine; and make the best of his way off Coro near to Marycaibo where General Miranda has landed<sup>3</sup>—the particulars of which is enclosed, and such intelligence as I have been able to collect:—My reasons for ordering the Elephant on this service is from a report that the enemy's ships are to proceed there to defeat the Expedition.

Should Captain Dundas not find them there he is to go from thence to Jamaica. By him I have sent extracts of your letter of the 19<sup>th</sup> of July<sup>4</sup> and a copy of Lord Howick's of the same date, for the guidance of Vice-Admiral Dacres, within whose district General Miranda has landed.

The Pickle Schooner accompanies the Elephant in order to convey to England the most recent accounts from the Spanish Main.

I have the honor to be Sir,

Your most obed. humble servant

ALEX. COCHRANE.

<sup>1</sup> Biggs, p. 180, mentions the arrival of the *Ferret* at Aruba, with despatches, on September 13.

<sup>2</sup> Admirals' Despatches, Leeward Islands, Vol. 25. Marked as received October 26.

<sup>3</sup> Evacuating the Main on August 13, Miranda had occupied the island of Aruba, where Biggs, p. 181, under date of September 21, reports the *Elephant* as having just sailed for Jamaica and the *Pickle* for England.

<sup>4</sup> Probably that alluded to in note 4 on p. 524.

XIX. REAR-ADmirAL SIR ALEXANDER COCHRANE TO THE SECRETARY.<sup>1</sup>

*Northumberland*, Carlisle Bay,  
BARBADOES, 4<sup>th</sup> Nov., 1806.

Sir,

Be pleased to inform the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty that an establishment of privateers is formed at the Port of Cayenne, at present they consist of one ship, the Victoire of 32 guns and 180 men; His Majesty's late sloop Favorite; a brig of 16 guns and 120 men, and two stout schooners.

They cruise in a situation from that port to windward of Barbadoes, so as to be able to regain it with their prizes, which they never send to any of their islands to leeward.

I beg leave to recommend that the packets may keep to the north of Latitude 15° until they come nearly into the Longitude of this Island, to avoid the enemy's cruisers, which are now become more numerous than ever, and of greater force.

I am sorry to say that they have been particularly successful of late and have made some most valuable captures. The taking of the mast ship will enable them to send more cruisers to sea.

General Miranda is returned from Aruba and is going down to Trinidad.<sup>2</sup>

I have the honor to be Sir

Your most obedient humble servant

ALEX. COCHRANE.

<sup>1</sup> Admirals' Despatches, Leeward Islands, Vol. 25. Marked as received December 13.

<sup>2</sup> The *Leander* left Aruba September 27, under convoy of the British ship *La Seine*, in which Miranda arrived at Barbadoes on November 2. In a few days he sailed for Trinidad, where he remained till December, 1807, when he returned to London. Biggs, pp. 208, 209, 248. So ended in failure the Miranda Expedition of 1806.

## REVIEWS OF BOOKS

*Historical Jurisprudence: An Introduction to the Systematic Study of the Development of Law.* By GUY CARLETON LEE, Ph.D. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1900. Pp. xv, 517.)

THIS is an interesting book and a good book. It is scholarly in treatment and useful in its material; it shows the marks of broad and thorough study of the subject, and is clearly arranged and perspicuously written. It should prove a useful elementary text-book for the study of Roman law or of early English institutions.

The book is so good that one feels rather provoked with Dr. Lee for not attempting less and making it better. He has collected here facts about many systems of law, from that of old Babylon to that of contemporary Germany. He has tried to indicate the relation between these systems, and the growth of legal conceptions from the primitive notions of barbarians to modern times. That these great tasks cannot be satisfactorily accomplished in one small volume is obvious. That Dr. Lee has failed to accomplish them does not prove his work ill-done; it proves his plan unduly ambitious.

In the Introduction Dr. Lee has stated his purpose to "trace through all the tangled mazes which separate the two, the line of connection between the modern and the primitive conceptions of law;" "to discover the first emergence of those legal conceptions which have become a part of the world's common store of law, to show the conditions that gave rise to them, to trace their spread and development, and to point out those conditions and influences which modified them in the varying course of their existence." "Laws are . . . easily transplanted from one nation to another by the simple intercourse of commercial life;" "this exchange of legal conceptions, and often of actual laws, is part of the subject of Historical Jurisprudence; and by it is established the postulate of jurisprudence, that there is an abstract and universal science of right and justice to which all local and temporary systems conform, and from which they derive much of their law." "It is the duty of Historical Jurisprudence not merely to point out the contribution which each nation and race has made to the common product, but also to show how and why the law of one nation has been adopted by another." The book is divided into Part I., Foundations of law; Part II., The development of Jurisprudence; Part III., Beginnings of modern Jurisprudence. This division conforms entirely to Dr. Lee's purpose as expressed in the Introduction. Let us see how well the execution suits the plan.

Part I. deals with the laws of several ancient states : Babylon, Egypt, Phoenicia, Israel, India and Greece. In each case after a few words about the history of the country, there is a summary of portions of its law, and in one or two cases a brief statement of the influence of the law upon other systems. The discussion of the law is too short to do more than indicate the nature of the system. To put the whole law of India into thirty pages, for instance, is like drawing a completed landscape in thirty lines. All the fine discriminations, all the peculiar conceptions, all the individual atmosphere, in short, is lacking ; and it is this peculiar atmosphere of the law which for the purpose of comparative study is of most importance. The few pages which Dr. Lee devotes to a discussion of the influence of these systems upon more modern systems of law form the most suggestive and valuable portion of this part of the book. In a few pages we are told that the Babylonian law passed to the Phoenicians, and although we are warned that we have "No direct knowledge of Phoenician law" we are informed that through the Phoenicians the Babylonian law was carried to Greece and to Rome. The dogmatic method of Dr. Lee's discussion and the lack of constant reference to authorities detract from the value of these suggestions ; but such as they are, they seem to constitute the sole reason for being of Part I.

"The Development of Jurisprudence" is almost entirely devoted to a very good discussion of the history of the Roman law. In this portion of his work Dr. Lee appears to have combined the results of the best modern scholarship with his own study and thought. He states clearly, and with sufficient fullness for his purpose, the beginnings, the development, and the content of Roman law and its final codification in the *Corpus Juris*. This is followed by a brief but luminous description of the origin and growth of the canon law and a quite inadequate one of the barbarian codes.

"The Beginnings of modern Jurisprudence" is less satisfactory because it is more fragmentary. Dr. Lee has here traced the renewal of interest in the Roman law from the thirteenth century, and its reception in the modern European states. Here, if anywhere, was his opportunity to fulfill the promises of his preface. The Roman law, gradually permeating the Gothic jurisprudence of Spain, has been carried into the western and the eastern world ; the Roman-Dutch law, planted in the colonies of the Netherlands, absorbed into the English empire, has reacted strongly on English law and colonial institutions ; and in our own time Egypt and Japan attest the debt of the modern world to Papinian. Dr. Lee, however, passes all this by and instead of it gives a rather full sketch of the reception of the Roman law into Germany and France. The last chapter in the book is devoted to a history of English law to the time of Bracton ; the ground, in fact, covered by Pollock and Maitland. In forty pages Dr. Lee cannot hope to do much with a subject illuminated by the two large volumes of these authorities ; but, as was to be expected from him, he has given an enlightened, though brief, statement of the main points in the early history of English law.

Such is the scope of Dr. Lee's book, and it must be apparent that in it he has not borne out the promise of his preface. The bulk of the volume is legal history, pure and simple, and much the greater part, history of Roman law. Of Historical Jurisprudence (if such a thing exists) we find little outside the Introduction. We do find a useful elementary history of most of the systems of law that can interest us, presented clearly and judiciously.

JOSEPH H. BEALE, JR.

*The History of Colonization, from the Earliest Times to the Present Day.* By HENRY C. MORRIS. (New York and London: The Macmillan Co. 1900. Two vols., pp. xxiv, 459; xiii, 383.)

THIS book, the author says, owes its origin to "a natural interest in the affairs of the day." The recent war with Spain, leading to the acquisition of distant dependencies by the United States, interested Mr. Morris in colonial problems, and he sought in the history of colonization answers to the questions that the present position of our country stimulates. He found that many books had been written on colonies, but that "almost all are devoted to certain special phases, epochs, or fields of research, are written from the standpoint of some one nation, or are too technical to be available and interesting to the majority of readers." To fill the want implied, of a treatise on colonization covering the whole field and suited to the comprehension of the general public, this book was prepared. The introduction promises to the reader a discussion of the different types of colonies and of the conditions necessary to their success, and an exposition of the facts of their history that will show how the principles of colonial policy have been developed.

The task that Mr. Morris sets before himself is a difficult one. Most books on colonization confine themselves to some part of the field simply because colonies have differed so much in different periods, or under different conditions in the same period, that they do not lend themselves to the generalizations of the philosophic historian, and resist inclusion in a single book. A writer who would give us what Mr. Morris promises must be not only conversant with a very broad range of facts, but also endowed with a critical and constructive ability enabling him to use the facts with the utmost efficiency. Extensive reading and thorough training are the two requisites. The author of this book cannot be credited with a satisfactory measure of either.

In the preliminary chapter, on general principles, Mr. Morris shows such confusion of ideas as to destroy at once any hope that he can advance our knowledge of the theory of colonization. The reader is forced to doubt whether the author understands what has already been written on the subject, and whether he is competent even to compile the results of others' investigations. In a book of this kind the matter of classification is of primary importance, if we are to learn anything of the principles of colonization. But even in proposing a scheme of classification,

apart from any practical application of it, the author breaks down. He adopts Roscher's fourfold classification of colonies, but spoils its meaning by making the mode of acquisition, not the prevailing occupation, the distinguishing characteristic. Thus Roscher's *Eroberungskolonien* appear in his first class as "those created or acquired by military force." Such a class includes several kinds of colonies which need to be kept distinct, and does not distinguish the peculiar and interesting type for which Roscher designed it, the type in which the settlers gain a return not from economic production but from political ascendancy. The author does not, however, make a fruitful use of this or any other classification; he applies one or another without discrimination when he applies one at all.

Mr. Morris accepts anything that has been written on colonization, and finds a place for it somewhere. Statements that meant something in their original context become meaningless or inconsistent when they appear in the setting which he gives them. On page 11 we are told, in reference to the relation of mother country and dependency, that an agricultural colony "occasions little cash outlay; returns in general large profits. . . . These facts are well established by the evidence of history." On page 26 we are cautioned to remember our Leroy-Beaulieu, "It must never be forgotten, 'It is exceedingly rare that a colony furnishes a net profit to the mother country; in infancy it cannot, in maturity it will not.'" When one general statement is not contradicted by another it is generally disproved by facts given in the body of the book. Of the many examples of weak generalization that could be cited I select only one, the statement that throughout history "the colony the most distant from the mother country and the most unlike in climatic and agricultural conditions has always proved the most successful, prosperous and remunerative" (I. 22).

A study of the preliminary chapter will convince any reader who is at all conversant with the subject of colonization that he cannot expect to find the book of value except for the bare facts that it comprises. His interest then will lie in knowing the sources from which the facts are drawn; if he is denied original arrangement of the material and conclusions from it, he will hope that at least the facts are sound, and that the book will guide him to the best sources of information.

At first view one is impressed by the wealth of footnotes and by the bibliography, which covers more than thirty pages of fine print. But the longer one studies these the more disappointed does one become. A large part of the bibliography is simple padding. Colonization is a broad subject, but not so broad as universal history, and the bibliography covers pretty nearly that. Even though sections of it are distinguished as containing books not specifically devoted to colonization but "general works which are useful" there seems no excuse for including in these sections books like Caesar's *Commentaries* or Froissart's *Chronicles*. We are gravely warned that Ingulph of Croyland (that distinguished authority on colonization!) is now regarded as spurious. And the books which really have some bearing on colonization seem to have been sub-

mitted to no critical examination ; old and new, good and bad, are lumped together. There are some serious omissions in the bibliography, but many good books do appear there, and it is only to be regretted that these do not take a more prominent place in the body of the book.

The foot-notes which indicate (not always correctly), the authorities for statements in the text, betray an astonishing lack of critical perception on the part of the author. Apparently all books are to him equally trustworthy. A favorite authority for facts in any period of history is Cantù, *Storia Universale*, Turin, 1857, a compilation which was not considered reliable at the time when it was written, though the standard for such books was much lower than it is to-day. Even old Rollin figures among the authorities in the notes, though his name is decently omitted from the bibliography to make place for the more imposing Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Ammianus Marcellinus. For conditions in ancient Greece we are referred to *The Wealth of Nations*, for the causes of the decline of the Dutch East India Company to Miss Scidmore's *Java*; these are both of them excellent books, but they are hardly satisfactory for the purpose in hand. Good books are cited in the notes, but much oftener apparently than they were used by the author. Thus the name of Heyd's *Geschichte des Levantehandels*, the great secondary authority for Italian settlements in the East, appears not infrequently in the section devoted to medieval colonization, but little use is made of the valuable material in the book, and the author quotes about as much of it indirectly from Adams's *Civilization* as he does from the original.

There seems no need to discuss the contents of the book in detail, or to point out its errors in fact. The first part of Volume I., devoted to colonization in antiquity and in the Middle Ages, is especially poor. The modern period is better treated and as the history approaches the present day it constantly improves. In writing the history of recent events Mr. Morris shows a command of facts and a sense of proportion which are missing in the greater part of his work. It is a pity that he dissipated his energies over so broad a field.

The book will probably be well received by the public, for its subject is popular now and in general its style is agreeable, but it can make no claim to the attention of the student or the scholar.

CLIVE DAY.

*Sesostris.* Von KURT SETHE. [“Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Alterthumskunde Aegyptens,” II. 1.] (Leipzig : Hinrichs. 1900. Pp. 24.)

Of all the puppets which have been made to dance upon the stage of Egyptian history in response to Greek imagination, the most remarkable is that of Sesostris. The readers of this journal are too familiar with the fabulous achievements attributed to him by Herodotus, Diodorus, and all the rest, to require even a reference to them here. The question of

who and what was the real hero who inspired this gradual accumulation of traditions, dilating at last into the dominant figure of Egyptian, if not indeed of all ancient Oriental history, has always been of the greatest interest. How fascinating would be the Alexander romance if we did not know to whom it refers! The subject has been little touched since the days of Lepsius and De Rougé; with the exception of the careful Meyer all the later histories follow Champollion and Lepsius, who, on the flimsiest evidence, identified Sesostris with Ramses II. We all remember when in 1881 the world was startled by the announcement that the mummy of *Sesostris* had been discovered and lay in state at Cairo. His face and figure have since become more familiar to the layman than those of any other Pharaoh.

Professor Sethe has exhaustively examined in the above essay all the classical references to Sesostris and shows clearly that his identification with Ramses II. is entirely gratuitous, for neither: (1) his name, (2) his date, nor (3) his achievements suggest, much less permit such identification. On the other hand Sethe shows, on the basis of name, date and achievements, that, as Manetho has already indicated, Sesostris was Usertesen I. of the Twelfth Dynasty, a king some 700 years older than Ramses II. of the Nineteenth Dynasty. The writer well remembers the day in the Berlin Museum, when Sethe came in all aglow with the enthusiasm of discovery. He had been studying the coffin of a certain "Sebek-sen;" this man's name is composed of two parts; "Sebek" the name of a crocodile god, and "sen" meaning "likeness." The Egyptians in their exaggerated reverence for their divinities always *wrote* the god's name first in such a compound as the above, although they pronounced it last, thus: "Sen-Sebek" meaning "likeness of Sebek." It had flashed upon Sethe that "Usertesen" was another such inversion and that the final "sen" should be read first, thus: "Sen-*Usret*" or properly vocalized "Sen-Wosret" (in hieroglyphics *Sn-wsr*).<sup>1</sup> Any one who knows how far removed from the hieroglyphic are the forms of Egyptian proper names transmitted to us by the Greeks, will immediately see that Sesostris is a very natural corruption of Senwosret, and vastly nearer the hieroglyphic than the name of Ramses II. (*Wsr-m't-R'*), long ago accepted without difficulty by the historians. With this observation of Sethe's, the mighty Sesostris of the Greeks suddenly becomes more than legend, and takes a place in authentic history. The question of *name* is thus reduced to the following equations:

1. In Manetho: the old Usertesen I. = Sesostris.
2. On monuments: the old " " = Senwosret I.
3. Therefore Manetho's "Sesostris" = monumental "Senwosret I."

In *date* Sethe shows that practically all the classic sources place Sesostris far earlier than Ramses II., and in most cases at a time well suiting Senwosret I.

The question of career and achievements is too large to be treated here, but one further point it is essential to note. In harmony with the

<sup>1</sup> This had not been noticed before because Wosret is not a well-known deity.

Greek traditions of Sesostris, Senwosret I. is shown by the monuments to have been the first Egyptian conqueror of Nubia. Sethe (p. 17) places the southern limit of his conquest at Wadi Halfa, just below the second cataract, his triumphal tablet<sup>1</sup> having been found at that place. But it was at least 40 miles further south than this, for the list of conquered districts on the above tablet contains the name Sha't (*Š'w*). Now Sha't is mentioned some 500 years later by Thutmose (Thotmes) III. on the walls of his temple at Kummeh (40 miles above Wadi Halfa) as the place where the stone for this temple was obtained. Hence Sha't is in the vicinity of this temple, and of course above it on the river.<sup>2</sup> As Kummeh on the east shore, and its pendant fort on the west shore, formed the extreme southern frontier of Nubia afterward, permanently maintained by Senwosret I.'s family (the Twelfth Dynasty), the interesting fact appears that he himself conquered to the extreme limit all the territory afterward held by his dynasty. This fact is quite sufficient to account for the initial fame of his achievements, which ultimately made him the hero of tradition, absorbing not merely the reputations of the other Senwosrets of his dynasty, but also much of the glory of the Asiatic conquests which culminated 500 years later.

Sethe's results therefore add not a little lustre to the name of Senwosret I., the conqueror of Nubia, nearly 2000 B. C., and lend new dignity to the great Twelfth Dynasty. He is also to be congratulated on a brilliant and solid contribution to the study of Greek sources, and he has incidentally again illustrated how nearly useless for early Egyptian history such sources are, unless controlled by contemporary monuments.

JAMES HENRY BREASTED.

*The Apostolic Age: Its Life, Doctrine, Worship and Polity.* By JAMES VERNON BARTLET, M.A., Mansfield College, Oxford. [Ten Epochs of Church History.] (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1899. Pp. xliv, 542.)

HISTORIES of the Apostolic Age of the Christian Church vary somewhat painfully with the country in which they are written. Weizsäcker in Germany, McGiffert in America, Bartlet in England present diverse pictures according to their measure of scientific spirit and their critical judgments as to the date and value of the sources. The comfort which perplexed students have felt in the growing consensus of German critics respecting the chronology of early Christian documents will be disturbed by this work of Professor Bartlet, whose canon of apostolicity is more confident even than that of the early Church, and whose chronological distribution of the documents is sadly at variance with modern German and

<sup>1</sup> The writer is about to publish the first complete copy of this tablet in the next number of the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, London. ("The Wadi Halfa Stela of Senwosret I.")

<sup>2</sup> The second cataract extends below the temple, hence the Sha't quarries must have been *above* the temple, for it is impossible to drag stone boats *up* the cataract.

American tendencies. The preface makes a good impression: "This is the crucial question for every student of the Apostolic Age: 'What think you of Acts—is it genuine history or has idealism largely come between its author and the reality?'" Ramsay's glorification of Luke as "among the historians of the first rank" is then contrasted with McGiffert's opinion that the author of Acts is inaccurate because of prepossessions of his own time. Bartlet promises to "let his decision between the two views work itself out gradually through discussion of each point on its own merits." The general reader will perhaps make from this the mistaken inference that the characteristic result of severe historical criticism is represented by McGiffert. Dr. Cone's careful work seems to be unknown and Weizsäcker's classic treatise, which in its comparison of Acts and the Pauline epistles is a masterly instance of historical method, is all but ignored. Ramsay, Hort and Sanday have had the chief influence on the work. In the discussion of each point as it emerges we have a modified exhibition of Ramsay's treatment of Acts, the result of which is the obscuration of the real Paul and a failure to grasp the issues. A passive reader will hardly discover what the problems of this period are. Whoever tamely accepts with Bartlet the account in Acts xvi: 3, which narrates Paul's circumcision of the son of a Jewish mother and a Greek father in order to please the Jews of the neighborhood, should rouse himself by reading the fifth chapter of Galatians, which, according to Bartlet, had only just been written: "Behold I Paul say unto you that if ye be circumcised Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect to you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace." To reconcile the story in Acts with this is a psychological impossibility and the details of Mr. Bartlet's discussions are vitiated by his inability to grasp such downright antagonisms.

Another defect of the book is that which is so pronounced a characteristic of Ramsay, an *alles wissen wollen*, which, united with an exaggerated valuation of the sources, ends in a habit of extracting large and ingenious references from slight and innocent remarks. We have several allusions to Luke's "subtle, allusive manner." This subtle indirectness, for example, at the close of Acts leaves us "the suggestion that the centre of the heathen world is destined to supersede the capital of Judaea as the centre of the Kingdom of God." By the same ingenuity of inference Paul's residence in Rome, enabling him to gaze forth from the centre of the world of men, is made to explain the more advanced cosmological conception of Christ in Colossians and Ephesians. The determination to know everything has an extreme illustration with the brief words of Acts, xiii: 3.—"They had also John as assistant." This is expanded as follows: "Besides looking after the material side of their arrangements, he probably helped to baptize converts and to teach them as a 'catechist' certain simple facts about Jesus the Christ and some of his notable sayings." Obviously Mr. Bartlet's work might have been briefer. He is somewhat bothered that Luke should repeat without modification the large predic-

tion of Agabus about a famine over the *whole* world, though he is calm over the general early predictions of a speedy end of all things. The concern shown is like that of the German rationalists who amended the hymn, "*es schläft die ganze Welt,*" by the more accurate substitution of "*die halbe.*"

In the second part of the work we have a careful and interesting exposition which depends for its truth upon the author's more than doubtful critical views. The Epistle of James is from 44-49 A. D. and therefore one of the earliest of Christian compositions. Its silence about Jesus is due to the fact that it is addressed in part to non-believing Jews. This quiet moralistic discourse surprisingly suggests to Mr. Bartlet the tone of Francis of Assisi and Savonarola. The Epistle to the Hebrews, probably written by Apollos in 62 A. D., is addressed to Christian Jews in Caesarea, and we are furnished with an imaginative description of the reading of the Epistle to the church meeting in Caesarea and of the effect produced. This reads somewhat strangely after Zahn's powerful argument—reinforced by Harnack—that the Epistle was written to a *Hausgemeinde* in Rome. II. Peter, genuine in part, is prior to I. Peter, and the latter, written 62-63, after Paul's death, uses Paul's phraseology in order to show how thoroughly Peter was one with Paul in thought. The Apocalypse is by the Apostle John, 75-80 A. D., and a period of fifteen more years is thought to have intellectually and theologically transformed the Apostle so that he could write the Fourth Gospel and completely abandon his eschatology. The *Didache* is brought into the account as a growth in three stages between 50 and 80 A. D. Use also is made of the Epistle of Barnabas (70-75 A. D.) as well as of Jude (70-80 A. D.) who writes not against Gnostics but Nicolaitan antinomians. These opinions will indicate sufficiently the resultant construction of the Apostolic Age, a construction which does not by consistency and plausibility lend aid to the judgments on which it is based.

FRANCIS A. CHRISTIE.

*Christianity in the Apostolic Age.* By GEORGE T. PURVES, D.D., LL.D., recently Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis in Princeton Theological Seminary. [Historical Series for Bible Students, Vol. VIII.] (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1900. Pp. xx, 343.)

WHILE it is true that critical scholarship has outgrown most of those extravagances that marked its *first* ages, and has become, relatively speaking, conservative, all recent volumes of any importance upon the Apostolic Age,—unless we may accept the work of Zahn,—have shown great caution and discrimination in the use of the book of Acts as an historical source, and have shown a tendency to recognize several of the epistles of the New Testament as either reworkings of apostolic materials or as pseudonymous. It would seem, therefore, impossible for an historian of the period to avoid the serious discussion, or at least to escape

the influence of a generation of criticism. It would probably be incorrect to say that Dr. Purves has proved an exception to such an expectation, but his work gives but few evidences of critical influence. In accordance with the admirable plan of the series to which his volume belongs, he has considered briefly the sources upon which his work rests; but in no case has he surrendered an element of the traditional view as regards the authorship of the New Testament writings, even as regards II. Peter. And although he occasionally passes lightly over the supernatural occurrences in the opening chapters of Acts, he unquestioningly accepts the book as a piece of historical work of the first order. Even when theological matters are not at issue, Dr. Purves shows unwillingness to concede anything of importance to recent scholarship. Thus as regards the location of the Galatian churches, a matter of late so ably re-argued by Ramsay, he holds steadily to the view of Lightfoot. It is therefore easy to understand why he should reject the two-source hypothesis as to the origin of the synoptic gospels, upon which New Testament scholars are so generally agreed, and prefer the hypothesis of Westcott and others of an oral gospel used by the three evangelists.

But if the book is open to serious objections from the point of view of the critical historian, it is hardly more acceptable to the historical theologian. Dr. Purves's position forbids his handling the difficult but fundamental questions as to the relation of Pauline and early Christian thought concerning the Second Coming of Christ with current Judaism, or that of other elements with current Graeco-Roman philosophy. In its exposition of the Pauline theology, however, the book is not without value. Dr. Purves is a trained exegete, to whom Paulinism is by no means a closed volume. While, therefore, the scope of the series does not permit any large treatment of biblical-theological subjects, in so far as it is devoted to direct exposition, it is welcome. Naturally, however, we should not expect in it any marked recognition of other than canonical writings as co-ordinate sources of early Christian teaching.

Altogether, therefore, we must say the volume is what its author probably intended to make it,—a well-balanced presentation of the history of the apostolic age from the point of view of those who, while using the methods of current criticism, reject such of its results as do not square with a presupposed theological position as regards inspiration.

SHAILER MATTHEWS.

*The Sources and Literature of English History from the Earliest Times to about 1485.* By CHARLES GROSS. (London and New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1900. Pp. xx, 618.)

No scholar can look at this book without an immediate sense of acknowledgment to its author, deepening into real gratitude and appreciation as he examines it further. It is true that he may suppress a sigh when his thoughts turn to a cherished hoard of bibliographical notes and references, painfully gathered through toilsome years; realizing that as far

as present value goes, he might have saved his labor, for here is all his private bibliographical lore in print for the public. If he is a teacher, a dubious remembrance may rise in his mind that a certain course of bibliographical lectures will have to be rewritten, now that so much of its contents is in a shape to which his students can be referred once for all. He may guess that the pleasant sense of indispensableness to a group of colleagues and students from being the sole source of information about a little special field is a sensation to be experienced no more, now that Dr. Gross is at everybody's service. But after all these are part of the price we pay for progress, familiar in the history of the race as of the individual, and in material as well as intellectual fields. What is really important is that we have at last a full, scholarly, well classified bibliography of English medieval history, quite equal to anything that exists for the continental countries.

Wattenbach's *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen*, Lorenz's continuation of the same work, and Franklin's *Sources de l'Histoire de France*, which suggest themselves from the similarity of the period they cover in their respective countries, are really not similar works, since they discuss only primary sources, while Dr. Gross's bibliography includes a description of secondary works also. The three works with which it is most distinctly comparable are therefore, Dahlmann-Waitz-Steindorff, *Quellenbuch der deutschen Geschichte*, Monod's *Bibliographie de l'Histoire de France*, and Pirenne's *Bibliographie de l'Histoire de Belgique*.

Dr. Gross's bibliography does not cover as long a period as either of these works, Dahlmann-Waitz in its latest edition coming all the way down to 1890, Monod to 1789, and Pirenne to 1598 for all of the Netherlands, and to 1830 for the Belgian provinces. Correspondingly the English bibliography contains only a few more than 3000 items, while that of Germany contains more than 6500, that of France more than 4500, and even that of the Netherlands, 2084. On the other hand, for the period which his work does cover, Gross includes articles in periodicals and in transactions of societies, not merely independent works, as do the other three books. Again, Gross distributes his titles into a much more detailed classification in groups and subjects, although the general twofold distinction into works which can be grouped under successive chronological periods, and those which are not so grouped are alike in all four works. But the most fundamental and important of all points of comparison is that Dr. Gross gives descriptions, analyses, criticisms or estimates of a large proportion of the books he names, while all the other bibliographies restrict themselves to a mere statement of the title, place and date of publication, editions, size and form. There can be no doubt of the superiority of this method of treatment. A mere list of titles leaves all but the barest fact of publication still to be looked up by the searcher, whereas some further information as to character, contents and relations to other books, and some expert judgment as to merits, often indicates the value or valuelessness of the book for the purposes for which the student wishes the references. In addition there is the innate inter-

est of much of this information about books. It is true that the judgment of the maker of the bibliography will not always be correct, that his estimates will not always be accepted,—and indeed we should be inclined to dispute more than one of Dr. Gross's *dicta*; but such shortcomings or differences of opinion are as nothing compared with the great value given to the entries by this additional information and by the statements, criticisms, and "appreciation," prefixed to each section.

The work is divided into four parts, the first, including about one quarter of the book, being devoted to "general authorities," the other three, to the period of origins, the Anglo-Saxon period, and that between 1066 and 1485, respectively. England, Wales and Ireland are dealt with, but Scotland is not, or at least is only included occasionally, as are several other countries, when their affairs are influential on English history. The first part is necessarily somewhat incoherent, involving lists and descriptions of bibliographical works, journals, works on the sciences auxiliary to history, the archives, collections of sources printed by public and private bodies and by individuals, and secondary works on a great variety of historical subjects which do not fall properly in the later chronological treatment. Perhaps the most noticeable feature about this section is its catholicity. The author, as might be expected from his earlier work, does not hesitate to include much institutional, antiquarian, and almost technical matter that frequently receives but scant recognition or attention from the historical student. Particularly is this true of his sections on local history and on commerce, industry, and agriculture. Part II. is necessarily short, though it contains more material of controversy than all the history of England since. In Part III. Dr. Gross's account of contemporary writings and legal collections, with their literature and the varying views held or conclusions reached upon them by modern scholars, takes up much more space than the list of independent works of modern scholars. Indeed, a single item like the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* or *Nennius* is the occasion for a long paragraph of references to editions and translations, for a list of half a dozen or more writers on the subject, and a paragraph summing up conclusions.

A full half of the book remains to Part IV., the period from the Norman Conquest to 1485, and here again much more than half the space, some 225 pages, is required to describe the original sources.

The description of the chronicles and the main bodies of documents, classified under various subdivisions of place and subject, is given with a fullness and continuity quite unknown elsewhere. The wealth of chronicles which we possess for this period, especially for the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, comes out clearly, especially so in the convenient list of contemporary chroniclers by reigns which Dr. Gross has drawn up. And yet the description of the more varied contemporary source-material is vastly more impressive. In official records of Parliament, of the various law-courts, of government offices, in taxation-rolls, city, manorial, episcopal and monastic records, wills, correspondence, poetry, and in still other forms, we have the raw material from which a true knowledge

of the past will eventually be constructed. In such documents, the personal bias of the writer is at a minimum, for he had usually no ulterior motive, no intention of doing anything more than to preserve a record; ignorance of the facts cannot be charged against the compilers for they describe what passed under their very eyes, or expressed what was in their own thoughts. Above all this kind of records extends into all the minute facts of daily life, all the realities of the normal life of the world of the time, all the personal doings of actual men and women. It is doubtful whether any one has ever realized the immense mass of this contemporary material for the history of civilization in England in the medieval centuries, until it has been thus listed and described. For instance, of one kind of documents, those concerning the Church, in one class, the bishops' registers, there are some thirteen from nine different dioceses here recorded as being in print. The whole history of the Church has been surrounded with such a mist of ancient and modern polemics that if one turns to the reading of these plain records of the every-day routine, the normal, strenuous and mostly beneficent work of a medieval bishop, it is like breathing a new and fresher air.

Similarly town and gild records, church-wardens' accounts, household books and others which even the author after all his fullness of classification is obliged to group as "miscellaneous," exist in numbers that few special students even have known of, except indeed as in this particular class they were already indicated in Dr. Gross's earlier bibliography. It is in the extraction of titles of such works from the *Transactions* of local societies in which they have been buried, their discovery among the issues from obscure provincial publishing houses, and the brief indications of their contents, that some of the most original, most laborious and most useful of Dr. Gross's work has been done.

Some four hundred secondary works on the history of the period from 1066 to 1485, is a much shorter list than that of works in German and French history during the same period, even including articles in journals. A series of appendices analyzing the *Reports* of the Historical Manuscripts Commission and the *Rolls Series*, and regrouping the principal narrative, official, and legal sources in a chronological list, and an admirable index, completes the tale of acknowledgment of our various items of indebtedness to the author of this bibliography.

Omissions will no doubt show themselves, though our search has so far not disclosed them except in cases where there was a sufficient reason; differences of judgment of course exist; some criticism might perhaps be made of the principle of subdivision of subjects; but the one sentiment among students of English history will be one of grateful appreciation for this work, and of earnest hopefulness that an equally good scholar will some time perform the same service for the modern history of England.

EDWARD P. CHEYNEY.

*Collection de Documents pour l'Histoire Religieuse et Littéraire du Moyen Age:*

Tome I. *Speculum Perfectionis, seu Sancti Francisci Assisiensis Legenda Antiquissima.* Nunc primum integre edidit PAUL SABATIER. (Paris: Fischbacher. 1898. Pp. ccxiv, 376.)

Tome II. *Fratris Francisci Bartholi de Assisio Tractatus de Indulgentia S. Mariae de Portiuncula.* Nunc primum integre edidit PAUL SABATIER. (Paris: Fischbacher. 1900. Pp. clxxxiv, 204.)

IN the first of these volumes, Sabatier prints a document which he argues is not only the oldest biography of Francis of Assisi, but also the one in which the character of the saint is portrayed most vigorously and poetically. He maintains that it was written by Brother Leo, less than a year after the death of St. Francis, and was finished May 11, 1227, at Portiuncula. He is especially interested in it because it is almost identical with the document which he reconstructed by internal criticism from the *Speculum Vitae* of 1509 and which he used as one of the sources for his *Life of St. Francis*. The document, as he reconstructed it by internal evidence, contained 118 chapters. Of these, 116 are in the actual *Speculum Perfectionis*, which contains in addition 8 more. Sabatier may well be pleased with such a proof of the soundness of his method in internal criticism. It is too early as yet to pronounce a judgment upon his claims as to the date, authenticity and authorship. His arguments have been controverted by some of the ablest specialists, and as yet there is no unanimity of opinion.

In the second volume, in addition to the treatise of Bartholus, Sabatier prints the more ancient sources for the history of the famous indulgence of the Portiuncula. In the *Life of St. Francis*, Sabatier wrote: "With the patience of four Benedictines (of the best days) we should doubtless be able to find our way in the medley of documents, more or less corrupted, from which it comes to us, and little by little we might find the starting-point of this dream in a friar who sees blinded humanity kneeling around Portiuncula to recover sight." This is a task that he has undertaken. In his laborious and loving study he has been led to change his opinion as to the origin of the indulgence. When he wrote the *Life*, he believed that the indulgence had "no direct connection with the history of St. Francis." On p. 444 of the English translation his opinion was stated even more positively. "Did Francis ask this indulgence and did Honorius III. grant it? Merely to reduce it to these simple proportions is to be brought to answer it with a categorical No."

The study of the earliest documents has led him to change this opinion, and in his zeal for truth he does not hesitate to confess what he believes to have been his error. A brief summary cannot do justice to his point of view, and can merely indicate the chief outlines of his

discussion. He controverts the argument of the "improbability in representing Francis, a declared opponent of privileges and the chief of an order just founded, as imploring from the Holy See an exorbitant favor," by the argument that "this indulgence is not a privilege, it is an act of love on the part of the sovereign pontiff for the members of the church. Neither the Chapel of the Portiuncula nor the Minorites were to receive the slightest profit from it." The argument from the silence, with regard to the indulgence, observed by the earliest biographers of St. Francis he thinks is no longer tenable. The *Legend of the Three Companions* published by Marcellino da Civezza and Teofilo Domenichelli is, as they argue, one of the earliest and most authentic sources, and this document is explicit on the subject of the indulgence. As the authenticity of this biography is questioned, Sabatier does not care to press this point, but turns to the consideration of the traditional biographies. He argues that the various authors have copied from one another, and that we have, properly speaking, only two biographies: one by Tommaso da Celano, the other by the Three Companions. The latter cannot be said to have made no mention of the indulgence, because we do not possess their work in its primitive form. The portions which have been lost may have contained a full statement as to the origin of this indulgence. Tommaso da Celano would not have been permitted by Gregory IX. to speak of the indulgence, as this pope regarded it "as indiscreet and dangerous." But the silence of the earlier biographies is "more apparent than real." "Without the indulgence, the chapters which they all consecrate to chanting the glories of the little sanctuary of Portiuncula appear . . . inexplicable." This is merely a bald summary of his arguments, stated as far as possible in his own words, but very greatly abridged.

To the present reviewer they seem far from conclusive. In fact, Sabatier does not seem wholly ingenuous in neglecting what is (as has been pointed out by Mr. Lea in his *History of Confession and Indulgences*, III. 238) the strongest argument against the genuineness of the legend. "Tommaso da Celano expressly tells us that no layman was allowed to enter it [the church of the Portiuncula], and this injunction is crystallized in the legend that when Piero da Catania, whom St. Francis had put at the head of the Order, died and was buried in the Portiuncula, and, coruscating in miracles, brought multitudes of worshippers to it, Francis, on returning to Assisi, went to his tomb and addressed him: 'Brother Peter, in life you were always obedient to me; as, through your miracles, we are pestered by laymen, you must obey me in death. I therefore order you on your obedience to cease from the miracles through which we are troubled by laymen.'" Other arguments which Sabatier has not answered are set forth in Mr. Lea's work, as well as elsewhere.

In conclusion it is hardly necessary to say that both of these volumes are models, in most respects, of critical scholarship. We owe a great debt of gratitude to Sabatier for the information which he has made ac-

cessible about the early history of the Franciscan Order and its chief members, for the scholarly editions of new texts, and for the indefatigable zeal with which he has labored on even the most minute points.

*Histoire de la Marine Française. Vol. II. La Guerre de Cent Ans; Révolution Maritime.* Par CHARLES DE LA RONCIÈRE. (Paris : Plon, Nourrit and Co. 1900. Pp. 560.)

M. DE LA RONCIÈRE'S new volume is devoted mainly to the Hundred Years' War, but with regret it must be said at once that one rises from the perusal of it with little more knowledge of the effect of naval action upon the course of that long struggle than one had when one began. Facts it is true are lavished upon us with a profusion that tells of infinite labor and an unsurpassed enthusiasm for research. But facts and research alone will not make a naval history. Rather for the bulk of readers do they tend by themselves to deepen the obscurity that hangs round an obscure subject. Without some sustained attempt to correlate the apparently disconnected events, to deduce from them some kind of principles, to explain their bearing on the development of naval science, and their general place in the broad progression of the war, such a work sinks to the position of a chronicle. It cannot be called a history. Yet M. de la Roncière almost chokes his subject with ill-digested facts. He spares us nothing, no matter how minute and how little germane to the matter in hand. He can scarcely draw breath for a moment to help us get our bearings, and even when he does his exposition is sometimes far from luminous and not always sound. Nor has he the excuse that his main purpose is to rescue from oblivion the exploits of the French marine. For the greater part of his story is not concerned with the French marine at all, but is devoted to the exploits of Spanish, Italian, and other squadrons hired by the French government or with which French officers or French ships were serving. Not that such matters should not find a place in a history of the French navy, for therein lies its universal interest and importance. As M. de la Roncière himself has so ably pointed out, France throughout the Middle Ages was the focus of the naval art. Every existing influence was brought directly to bear upon its navy and left its mark. To explain the French navy all these influences must be followed and understood. A real history of the French navy would be also a real history of the art of war by sea. Around no other marine could the work be so artistically and logically arranged. But of this broad fact, which in his first volume M. de la Roncière seemed about to handle with so much skill, his grip grows looser as he proceeds and we feel with genuine disappointment that a great opportunity is being missed.

Nor can our reluctant fault-finding stop here. For so far from carrying further our knowledge of the strategy, tactics and material of medieval navies, he leaves it behind the point it has already reached, and even tends to cover up what other workers to some extent have laid bare. The antiquary's lack of interest in the living professional aspect of the

subject is no doubt in some measure to blame. Indeed M. de la Roncière has so far neglected to equip himself for this part of his task, that throughout the work he makes no distinction between strategy and tactics and frequently uses the one word for the other. The fault is also partly due to a certain want of precision in his work. The richest and most illuminating authority on medieval naval warfare is the *Victorial* of Diaz de Gomez, and M. de la Roncière rightly devotes a chapter to it. Yet the inadequacy of his method will be apparent if we consider how he deals with the passage describing the formation of the English fleet in the action off Ambleteuse. The passage as quoted in a note is as follows:—“Ficieron una as á los balleneros mayores é pusieron á los espaldas dos naos grandes é una coca de Alemania é los balleneros pequenos pusieron en medio.” On this foundation M. de la Roncière writes thus:—“Les Anglais se formaient en bataille suivant l'ordre traditionnel (of which he has nowhere told us anything) en première ligne les grands baleiniers flanqués sur les ailes de deux gros nefs et d'une coque d'Allemagne ; les petits bâtiments étaient placés en soutien.” Can this by any stretch of courtesy be called an adequate rendering? The Spanish has nothing about two or more “lines” and nothing about “supports.” The real crux of the passage is, like the “herse” at Hastings, what did the author mean by “una as.” Yet this is passed over without a word, though an explanation is not far to seek and that a very plausible one and one that excludes the assumption of two or more lines. M. de la Roncière's paraphrase of the concluding sentence, which relates how the vessels took up their stations in the calm, is equally open to objection. “Esto facian” says the original “con los bateles, é aun avia algunos balleneros de remos é de vela.” Of this he writes “Faute de vent les bateaux et quelques baleiniers mixtes à rames et à voile remorquèrent les voiliers à leur poste de combat.” Yet the original does not say the “ballingers” did the towing. The point of the passage, which M. de la Roncière entirely misses, is that some at least of the “ballingers” were to some extent vessels of free movement, and were able to get into position without being towed. These points may seem minute, but when a passage so rare and invaluable, a true *locus classicus* on which turns the whole question of medieval formations and the whole question of free and subservient movement, is found to be so loosely dealt with, the inevitable effect is seriously to prejudice our confidence in the whole work.

When at last M. de la Roncière brings himself to a serious consideration of material, the same want of precision continues. Towards the end of the volume he attempts to deal with the *Révolution Maritime* which he regards as taking place at the end of the fifteenth century ; and here disappointment increases to despair. It is as though we were watching a man hunting for curiosities amongst half-completed excavations and in his eagerness to fill his museum recklessly covering up what the painful labor of others has partially revealed. Indeed after all the work that has been done in his own and other countries there is really no excuse for such a chapter, for instance, as that entitled “Les Vaisseaux.” Far

better to have left the subject alone than to have dealt with it so. Take for example the difficult case of the galleon, around the development of which hangs the whole history of the genesis of sailing tactics. In the century or so with which he is dealing the galleon grew from being a modified galley or *mezzo-galera* into the ship of the line. It is hardly too much to say that in form, armament and tactical value galleons of 1475 could differ as much from galleons of 1575 as the steam frigates of the fifties differed from the cruisers of to-day. Yet in the single page which he deems the subject merits he deals vaguely with the galleon of the time and to explain what it was cites at random from authors and examples extending over the whole period as if they were contemporaneous. The same must regretfully be said of his chapter on "L'Artillerie de la Marine." Here again in the period under treatment naval ordnance developed from a crude and impotent infancy up to nearly what it continued to be in Nelson's time, and yet to explain any given nature of gun M. de la Roncière can quote with perfect indifference from authorities extending from the end of the fifteenth century far into the seventeenth. For such work the world is too old and France has given us the right to expect something better from one of her most distinguished scholars.

Still it is pleasant to be able to say that if the defects of the work seem glaring it is partly due to the real excellence of the bulk of it. They become conspicuous by contrast with the ungrudging and persistent labor the writer continues to disclose, the wide range he covers, and the mass of unsuspected sources of information he opens out. For the student of naval history, no matter what his nationality, the book must remain indispensable, a well from which he may draw inexhaustibly, a gazetteer which will seldom fail to direct his steps. Nor can it ever be denied a high place as having rescued from oblivion a teeming mass of history, and as affording a solid contribution to knowledge in a field that has been unaccountably neglected. As special examples of the value of the work may be mentioned the section on Jean de Vienne, on the attempted invasion of England in 1386, on Jacques Cœur, on the maritime policy of Louis XI. with the exploits of Coulon, and on the constitution and jurisdictions of the Four Admiralties; while for those who would study such widely different subjects as for instance the early attempts of France at maritime domination in the Mediterranean and the influence of the sea power on the Wars of the Roses material will be found in equal abundance.

JULIAN S. CORBETT.

*The Council of Constance to the Death of John Hus.* Being the Ford Lectures delivered in the University of Oxford in Lent Term, 1900. By JAMES HAMILTON WYLIE, M.A. (London: Longmans. 1900. Pp. 192.)

If there was one man of English speech from whom we had a right to hope for a fresh readable book on the Council of Constance, it was Mr. James Hamilton Wylie. For a quarter-century he has been engaged

on that close study of the early fifteenth century which has fruited in the successive volumes of his *History of England under Henry the Fourth*; and the breadth of view which saw England's history in every larger interest she shared with Christendom; giving us luminous chapters on Timur the Tartar and on the wars in Pruce, led him, above all, to trace the fortunes of the Latin Church. Nowhere perhaps in English have we so vivid portrayal as in his pages of the confusion wrought by the Great Schism, of the futile efforts at union, of the Pisan Council, of the ferment at Prague. But just here, in 1413, on the very threshold of the great gathering at Constance, the death of Henry brought his pen to a pause. It was a happy inspiration, born of a like breadth of view, which moved those who choose for Oxford a Ford lecturer on English history to win from him this supplement. The six lectures deal respectively with "Sigismund," the council's author; with "Constance," its scene; with the make-up and the beginning of "The Council" itself; with the "Deposition" of Pope John; with "John Hus"—his "Trial" and his "Death." To these, as a "Preliminary," the lecturer now adds a chatty enumeration of his sources, and at their close, as "L'Envoi," a word to the critics who have accused him of over-minuteness and of a want of literary style.

If Mr. Wylie's pages have no style, so much the worse for style. They have what is better—charm. Unlike enough is his gossipy, galloping story, reeking with the very smell and savor of the time it tells of, to the stately chapters in which the lamented Bishop Creighton has given us our other notable English account of the great Council; and those who wish all their history after a single model will hardly approve Mr. Wylie's. But to those who love individuality for its own sake, and especially if they like their history in the concrete, what was ever more companionable? Minute Mr. Wylie is; but all his details are significant. It is his sources which speak; and to every phrase and epithet of these new pages, despite their lack of learned *Apparat*, there has gone the same wealth of research which burdened with foot-notes his old. And while his fondness for archaisms, which gave such umbrage to the critics of his *Henry IV.*, here betrays itself only occasionally in quaint word or turn of phrase, the racy, devil-may-care Saxon of even his loosest paragraphs makes the English heart within one bound with glee.

Yet the history of the Council is but half told. By July of 1415, where he breaks off, schism was scotched and heresy singed; but reform was yet to grapple with. May he give us soon the rest of the story—whether as lectures like these or as chapters of an *England under Henry V.*

GEORGE LINCOLN BURR.

*The Reformation.* By WILLISTON WALKER. [Ten Epochs of Church History.] (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1900. Pp. x, 478.)

In attempting to give in four hundred pages a sketch of the Reformation movement from its beginnings in the fourteenth century to the close

of the Thirty Years' War, Professor Walker has not concealed from himself nor from his readers the difficulty of the task. He has wisely restricted himself to the continent of Europe, but, even with this limitation, he has been able only to indicate the salient points in the great transition. In his selection of names and incidents to be treated in some detail he has generally been happy, and the sense of proportion is nowhere offended. In his judgment of leading persons he has not sought to be original in any sense, but follows the best judgment of recent and careful scholarship. The entire absence of all reference to authority leaves one sometimes at a loss to trace his sources, but in the main it is evident that he has not written without a proper use of special studies on many controverted points.

While no one could be in doubt as to the author's Protestantism, his fairness in describing Roman Catholic institutions, as far as possible, from their positive side is most praiseworthy. There is a refreshing absence of all partisan abuse, which makes his careful analysis of the real dangers against which the Reformation contended so much the more convincing. The same moderation is evident in the description of sectarian divergences within Protestantism itself. The figure of Calvin finds naturally a central place, but full justice is done to all the widely divergent efforts to bring clearness and power into the vague and shifting forces of the anti-Catholic assault.

Novel to many readers of the conventional Protestant tradition, though not to any student of more recent literature, will be the accounts of pre-Reformation reform movements within the Catholic church itself. Most noteworthy, perhaps, in this direction is the chapter on the "Spanish Awakening." We have hardly become accustomed to the thought, that in Spain, the country of all others in which the principles of the Reformation found their most determined opposition, there was, long before Luther, a vigorous stirring of the religious consciousness against the evils which Luther and his followers tried to remove. Professor Walker brings out these reformatory efforts into the clearest light, but does not fail also to show that they were of necessity insufficient because they did not touch the great central fact of the responsibility of every human soul to its God, without the intervention of any other human authority whatever. So in regard to Italy; the encouraging signs of a spiritual awakening are given their due proportion, and then we are shown how these first efforts were crushed out by the necessities of maintaining the papal establishment, with all its vast consequences for the Italian communities. On the other hand it is made evident that theoretical declarations of freedom and responsibility, such as the doctrinaires of the early fourteenth century and of the conciliar period produced in abundance, were destined to remain futile until they were given concrete expression in the German revolt against priestly tyranny. And again the extravagant demonstrations of the Radical parties from Münzer to Servetus are set in their true light as inevitable outgrowths of the liberal spirit, which it was Luther's first care to hold within the leading-strings of his own conservative instinct.

With so much of clearness and justness in his view of the Reformation, one cannot help feeling a certain regret that the limitations of the series in which his volume appears did not allow Professor Walker to embody his results in a form that would have admitted some more distinctly literary treatment. One feels at every step the formula of a text-book demanding a little something about everything, rather than the spirit of an essay which should interest and hold the attention by its consistent working out of a main theme. The positive qualities of this volume make it rise easily above the general level of the series, but after all it is neither a good text-book nor an interesting book to read. It lacks, almost necessarily, the system of the former and the style appropriate to the latter. Let us wish to Dr. Walker in the inspiration of his new surroundings, the leisure to work out, free of all limitations, such an interpretation of the Reformation period as the literature of the past score of years makes possible and desirable.

*Theodore Beza, the Counsellor of the French Reformation (1519-1605).* By HENRY MARTYN BAIRD, Professor in New York University. [Heroes of the Reformation.] (G. P. Putnam's Sons: New York and London. 1899. Pps. xxi, 376.)

No one of the volumes of the series which has been planned under the editorship of Professor Jackson, finds so large an empty space waiting for it as this. Of the two best-known lives of Beza, the fragment of Baum was written in 1843 and the complete work of Heppe in 1861. English readers have had no other source of information concerning Beza except such slight sketches of ten or twenty pages as appear in Harbaugh's *Fathers of the Reformed Church* or Hook's *Ecclesiastical Biography*.

No one could be better qualified by knowledge of contemporary related literature than Professor Baird, to write a sketch of the man who succeeded Calvin as intellectual leader of the French Reformation, and was during the last thirty years of his life one of the most conspicuous ecclesiastical personages in Europe. Professor Baird has been faithful to his own ideal expressed in his recent review of Dr. Lindsay's *Martin Luther*, and has given us a volume which "intended for general readers, naturally avoids any display of authorities, although it is evidently built upon a firm foundation of solid scholarship hidden from view."

The title of this series, "Heroes of the Reformation" (a title which Dr. Emerton humorously represents the ghost of his hero, Erasmus, as refusing with dismay), suggests a somewhat eulogistic method of treatment. Dr. Baird, while adopting this tone, is not betrayed into any unconscious suppression or distortion of facts, and he is free by instinct from the partisan special pleading of writers like D'Aubigné and Janssen, which the prospectus of the series promised to avoid. There is a clear cool atmosphere of candor about Chapter IV., "Treatise on the Punishment of Heretics," very refreshing to those who have been wearied by the

heated clamor with which denominational polemics have so often filled the grave and studious apartments of history. The eulogistic tone however occasionally betrays the author into a pleonastic use of adjectives, which does not increase the effectiveness of his strong and dignified style. A conspicuous instance is found on page 141, where the adjective "great" is applied four times in ten lines.

Occasionally also he seems to be betrayed into a slight exaggeration of emphasis by the defensive tone which is natural to one who is so familiar with what most of his readers have no knowledge of, the mass of contemporary calumny showered upon Beza and other heroes of the Reformation. At page 254-262 it might have been pointed out that the abuses of plurality, non-residence, etc., of which Beza complained had existed also under Edward before the "retrograde movement tending to the introduction of theories and practices long since discarded," had begun under Elizabeth. (See Peter Martyr to Bullinger; Bucer to Calvin, both 1550. *Original Letters*, Parker Society.)

On page 279 Dr. Baird tells us: "The Swiss reformers, Bullinger, Beza, and all the others, were shocked, amazed, indignant" at Ochino's view that bigamy was not prohibited by divine law. Unless Dr. Baird uses the word "reformers" in the technical sense rather than in the popular sense of the title of the series, this accumulation of adjectives seems superfluous, because a scholastic admission of the possibility of bigamy was not an absolutely unheard-of opinion. Luther and Melanthon did not consider bigamy a sin *per se*, and in company with several other prominent divines they expressly sanctioned the recent bigamous marriage of Philip of Hesse with the written agreement that he was not to abandon his first wife.

In general the realism of this strong and clear piece of historical portrait painting might perhaps be increased if the high lights were thrown out by a little more shadow. It is now accepted as a principle that the controversial blackguarding which even admirable men in the sixteenth century showered upon their opponents is not to be taken seriously. The latest biographers of Pietro Aretino show good reasons for believing that even that typical blackmailer has, by a sort of poetic justice, suffered because the calumnies of his adversaries have been too unquestioningly accepted. Is it not also probable that students of the sixteenth century ought to discount, at least to some slight extent, the stately and exaggerated compliments of its reigning epistolary and obituary style?

Not only general readers of history but all who are engaged in the task of teaching elementary sixteenth-century history to students who can use fluently no language but English, are indebted to Dr. Baird for accomplishing his task with the success that was to be anticipated from the author of the *Rise of the Huguenots* and its succeeding volumes.

PAUL VAN DYKE.

*England under the Protector Somerset.* By A. F. POLLARD. (London : Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co. 1900. Pp. 362.)

JUST as the policy pursued by King John proved to be extremely favorable to the development of English constitutional liberties, so the influence of Mr. Froude has been useful in bringing about an accurate study and truthful representation of English history during the Tudor period. Mr. Froude's dogmatism, reckless use of authorities, and subjective interpretation of history roused so much opposition in the minds of other students that they were driven to subject all sources of information to a new and closer scrutiny and have reached results very different from his and from those of his predecessors. Mr. Pollard's essay appears to be one of this group of works.

It is true that it is a deliberate effort to rehabilitate the Protector,—to lift him from the somewhat contemptible position in which Mr. Froude had left him, and to relieve him of the load of odium with which certain other writers had burdened him. Yet to say that Mr. Pollard holds a brief for Somerset does not necessarily imply that he has not written a trustworthy account of his life and administration. On the contrary his search for materials has been exhaustive, as witness the admirable bibliographical appendix, and his use of these materials has been sufficiently critical. His picture of the condition of England at the death of Henry VIII. is made extremely sombre in order to bring out the difficulties confronting Somerset, and the policy of the Duke of Northumberland is naturally painted in equally dark colors in the process of describing it as a reaction from the moderation of the Protector's administration. But these are the setting of the work rather than its main subject. This is a careful study of the actions and policy of the Protector from the death of Henry VIII. to his own execution, under the four aspects of his methods of government, his religious changes, his foreign policy, and his opposition to the agrarian changes in progress at the time. Under the first of these heads Mr. Pollard finds the key-note of the Protector's policy a desire to "lift the weight of absolutism which the Tudors had imposed on England," by sweeping away all the treason laws which then heavily encumbered the statute-book, by allowing freedom of speech in Parliament, and by increasing the importance of that body. He was "a believer in constitutional freedom."

In the same way in religious affairs his administration was a period of moderation, and of such change only as was approved by Parliament and Convocation and probably not distasteful to the mass of the people. Most of the religious changes were projects formed and prepared long before but withheld because of the reactionary or at least stationary attitude of Henry during his later years. The prelates who opposed the policy of the government in the debates in Parliament were not punished in any way, and there was not a single execution for any kind of religious opinion. Most of those instances of radical Protestant action and of religious coercion usually cited as characteristic of the reign of Edward

apply to the period after Somerset's fall. Indeed Mr. Pollard's most fundamental criticism of other historians of the period is that they make a habit of treating the reign of Edward VI. as a single whole, and therefore attribute to Somerset much that belonged to the administration of his successor and that was diametrically opposed to his policy and character. As a matter of fact the last four years of the reign of Edward, as contrasted with the first three, were marked by a reaction from "the Protector's experiment in liberty and toleration" to the arbitrary and repressive measures and the reckless unprincipled policy of the Duke of Northumberland.

It is to the Protector's attitude toward the social changes of the time that Mr. Pollard attributes his downfall. The members of the Council were typical "enclosers," and they moreover represented the feelings and interests of the majority in Parliament and of the landowning class in the country generally. Against the agrarian changes which were being carried out in the interests of such men and to the destruction of the lower classes in the country, Somerset and a small party of reformers set themselves, and used all the influence of his position. But the powers against them were too strong and the Protector was deposed. His execution occurred as a necessary step in the rise to unopposed power of his successor. In a vigorous and eloquent closing chapter on the Protector's work and character he is credited with being "one of the few idealists who have attempted to govern England." "His means were inadequate, his time was short, and the men with whom he worked had no eye for the loftiness of his aims, and no sympathy with the motives that impelled him. Yet his achievements were of no mean order. Immediate failure was but the prelude to ultimate success." In the long run the main lines of his policy have been followed and its main objects attained.

If the position which Somerset holds in history is not modified by Mr. Pollard's careful and spirited study, it will not be because a good plea has not been made for him.

E. P. CHEVNEY.

*The Successors of Drake.* By JULIAN S. CORBETT. (London and New York : Longmans, Green and Co. 1900. Pp. x, 464.)

THIS attractive volume forms a sequel to the same author's *Drake and the Tudor Navy* and carries the history of the great naval war with the Spanish Empire down to the end of Elizabeth's reign. Like that on Drake the present work is based upon deep and wide study of the literature and of original, in some important cases hitherto nearly or quite unknown, sources of the subject. Into this rich mass of materials the author has breathed the life of incisive independent thought and a crisp, lively, yet distinguished style.

Mr. Corbett thinks the prevalent view of the period as crystallized by Seeley to be "curiously, even perversely inadequate." Seeley says that the war after the defeat of the Armada was "chiefly a series of plundering expeditions in which the Government scarcely aimed at a single

national object," and that "the glory of 1588 tinged every succeeding year of the war: the sense of danger and the tension that had held the national mind for a whole generation was gone, and a new generation grew up to revel in victory and discovery." Mr. Corbett's researches on the other hand have led him to see in the same period "the birth of the Spanish navy," such "well-matured attempts as the campaigns of 1596 and 1597," a "new Armada off Ushant," Spinola at Sluys, and "Spanish naval stations established from end to end of the Channel," the invasion of Ireland and the "English cruising squadrons again and again driven off their ground by superior force." And even in the case of the expedition to Cadiz, the only naval event of Elizabeth's last decade ever dealt with in detail, Mr. Corbett disputes the dictum of "our first authority in naval history" that it was the Trafalgar of the Elizabethan war. To be sure, he says, it was the last naval victory, but "so far from being a crowning success it was rather an irretrievable miscarriage, that condemned the war to an inefficient conclusion."

So much for Mr. Corbett's general interpretation of the period. Historical investigation is, however, not his only object: he deliberately uses the events he relates to illustrate and inculcate great principles of the art of war. The general strategical lesson of the period which Mr. Corbett wishes to emphasize seems to be the "limitation of maritime power." Few men of the time saw that "there is a point beyond which hostilities by naval action alone cannot advance. It was an army that was wanting." And the "real object of Essex and the military reformers," though ostensibly a reorganization of the land forces with a view to coast defence, was, Mr. Corbett thinks, to form a corps for service beyond the seas, "a force that could reap where the fleet had sown."

So it is that the book deals largely with military as well as naval operations, for how closely interdependent are the sister services in a great war "nothing," says Mr. Corbett, "shows more emphatically than the last years of the Elizabethan war." "Indeed," he adds, "it is not too much to say that the campaign in which Mountjoy and Carew saved Ireland affords the first example in modern history of a naval force being rightly used by a military commander as a fourth arm."

The book has further, as was to be expected, great biographical interest. With the delightful magic of the historian's art the author has conjured from the dusty lurking-places of libraries and archives a cluster of great Elizabethan figures and made them glow upon his pages in living colors. There is the romantic, tragic, "almost inconceivable" Essex, who for a time was "to fill the place of Drake as the embodiment of the war spirit in England, a man who, had he been born like Drake into a station where all was to win by slow and persistent effort, might have hardened into one of the greatest figures of his time." Upon him indeed Mr. Corbett thinks, as Essex himself loved to dream, Drake's mantle fell rather than upon any other. The chief biographical interest of the book, however, centres perhaps about the enigmatic and scarcely less tragic figure of Raleigh, whom Mr. Corbett reluctantly feels compelled to deny a "high

and heroic part" in the last years of the war and whose reputation as an admiral "is scarcely less difficult to explain than that which Essex enjoyed in his lifetime." By the "bulk of his contemporaries he was detested as no better than a pushing and selfish adventurer. For us that view of him is forgotten and forgiven in his prophetic dream of empire and the witchery of his tuneful pen;" but "no single exploit, no single well-timed resolution lifts him amongst the great captains. His immortal Virginian dream, failure as it was, is his real monument. If that be put aside, and if, by an effort hardly possible, we can free our judgment from the spell of his pen and personality in order to follow dispassionately his career at sea, it will look as cold and bare to us, as it did to those of his contemporaries who were best able to judge."

Besides these two, many other great Elizabethans live and move in Mr. Corbett's pages: Vere, the dashing hero of the Low Country wars, Mountjoy, the defender of Ireland, and his trusty lieutenant "good George Carew," the old Lord Admiral whose service against the Spaniards lasted long after the glory of 1588, stout-hearted Lord Thomas Howard who deserves a place amongst the highest in the roll of Elizabeth's great sailors, Cumberland the great privateering earl, first to conquer the "virgin city of the Indies." On the Spanish side, too, apart from the ill-starred Sidonia, Drake's old foe, who still more helpless than in 1588 witnesses the triumph of Drake's successors, we meet many glorious names, above all perhaps Spinola, over the achievements of whose courage and skill Mr. Corbett lingers not only with the impartiality of the true historian, but with such unfeigned admiration as a great commander, whether friend or foe, elicits from a true lover of the great game of war.

As to the further contents of the brilliant historical narrative, a summary will not be out of place. After a description of the complex opening war moves of the year 1596, we see the Spaniards take Calais and England preparing the great expedition to Cadiz, which Mr. Corbett proceeds to tell most carefully and graphically on the basis of rich original authorities which he discusses in a learned and valuable appendix.

Mr. Corbett gives us further a careful account of Philip's three revengeful attempts to repeat with better success the enterprise of 1588, the "New Armada," the "Last Armada," and the armada which never even started for its destination, giving rise to the gibe, really a sigh of relief, that, having begun with an Armada Invincible, he had ended with an "Armada Invisible." The naval mobilization to meet this Armada is noteworthy, as is also the first great galley feat of Spinola, who now opens his brief but dazzling career. On the English side we have, after the dispersion of the "New Armada," the last attempt to invade Spain, a kind of futile invisible counter-armada, followed by the "Islands Voyage" with Raleigh's gallant deeds at Tagal to give a little tinge of brightness to his new portrait, and with the breathlessly interesting story of the missing of the treasure fleet.

After a fine graphic description of Cumberland's capture of Puerto Rico and a short sad chapter on the decline of the navy at the close of

the century which had seen the rise of English maritime power, we come to the most valuable account of "one of the few serious attempts to put in practice the strategical dream of attacking England through Ireland," the failure of which Mr. Corbett attributes to "the yet unmeasured power of the sea" and to "two sagacious soldiers who felt the mastery it gave."

After Cezimbra Road the narrative of events closes fittingly with the tragic chapter called "The Last of the Galleys" enabling Mr. Corbett to end his work on the Tudor navy as he began it, with strong emphasis upon the transition from the warship of the Middle Ages to the type which pointed to Nelson and Trafalgar. It is pleasant too that the galley should have emerged from this last trial, if not with success, yet with high honor to itself and above all to Spinola, whose greatness, however, only served to reveal with increased conclusiveness the superiority of the northern school.

Though the narrative proper ends with the Dutch bullet that stretched intrepid Spinola upon his galley deck, there remain two valuable chapters discussing the results of the long war and the navy as Elizabeth left it. "In spite," Mr. Corbett concludes, "of all that seems at first sight so old-fashioned in the instruments and ideas which Drake and his successors used, they differed only in design, and that in no large degree, from those with which Nelson brought the art to its zenith."

While it is possible that future writers may modify some of Mr. Corbett's verdicts, they will not alter the fact that he has written an excellent volume upon a period greatly in need of illumination. Amphibious as the heroes he has portrayed so well, he proves himself, whether describing operations of war by land or sea, equally instructing, stimulating and brilliant.

W. F. TILTON.

*Thomas Harriot, the Mathematician, the Philosopher, and the Scholar : developed chiefly from Dormant Materials, with Notices of his Associates, including Biographical and Bibliographical Disquisitions upon the Materials of the History of 'Ould Virginia.'* By HENRY STEVENS of Vermont, F.S.A. (London : Privately printed. 1900. Pp. xii, 214.)

THE editor of this book, Mr. Henry N. Stevens, tells us that the whole text has lain "printed off" since 1885; and the printing was commenced in January, 1878. Nevertheless, its contents have not been forestalled. Nothing has appeared about Harriots, since the earlier date, more important than the good but unoriginal article in the *Dictionary of National Biography* and three pages of critical estimate in the second volume of Dr. Moritz Cantor's *Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Mathematik*. During the eight years of its printing, this volume grew by the accumulation of successive discoveries, and thus cannot be quoted as containing any definite opinions, as the author himself warns us. "Repetition, and perhaps some contradiction, are acknowledged. But meandering thoughts and ill-digested narratives, though tedious, are not criminal." They are not only not criminal, but to a careful student, they

are more valuable than a unitary working-over of them might be. Certainly nothing in this little volume is in the least tedious. To one condemned to pass a large proportion of his time in reading the writings of German scientists who glory in writing awkwardly, and have carried that art to its last pitch of perfection, a style like this is simply delicious. Though Stevens uses the spelling "Hariot" throughout, yet in the last testament appended to this essay, the name at every occurrence appears as Harriots. An *s* very easily gets dropped from the end of the name of a writer, because it so often occurs in the possessive case; and doubled consonants in names were usually made single in latinization; as Copernicus for Koppernik, and Keplerus for Kepler. In the signature to a letter, printed as "Harriote," a final *s* may have been inadvertently taken for an *e*; *s* final, in much of the chirography of that period, looking a good deal like a modern *e*.

Our acquaintance with the man has hitherto been limited to a skeleton biography and a few slight notices, together with a treatise upon algebra based upon his papers but drawn up by another person. How is this acquaintance improved by the new publication? First, we are now presented with a speaking portraiture of his character and life. Next, Harriots' will had eluded more than one accomplished huntsman for such documents; but from the moment when our Vermonter entered upon the search the snuggest of *catiches* could no longer secure it from being drawn to light. So here it is, printed in full; and it affords us, aside from more general information, certain significant hints regarding the contents of the scientific papers the testator left behind him. Thirdly, the first half of a letter to Harriots relating to his observations in astronomy has, for a century, figured in the history of that science, having been unearthed, talked about, and ultimately published, by Baron Franz von Zach. The original is presumed to be still at Petworth Castle. But Stevens found the other half of the letter (bearing the signature of a person never suspected as its writer); and everybody will pronounce it to be much the more important half. Fourthly, Harriots, in his will, directed that N. Thorperley should receive his "mathematicall writings . . . to the end that after hee doth understand them hee may make use in penninge such doctrine that belongs unto them for publique uses as it shall be thought convenient by my Executors and him selfe;" after which the papers were "to be putt into a convenient truncke with a locke and key and to be placed in my Lord of Northumberlances Library and the key thereof to be delivered into his Lordshipps hands." But Stevens produces facts which go far to indicate that Thorperley was not only utterly indolent in the performance of the duty so imposed upon him, but was a person of the worst judgment in regard to such duty, and furthermore, was by no means as appreciative of what was entrusted to him as it is desirable that a literary executor should be. And to those facts Stevens adds others which prove that von Zach, who next went through the papers, did so quite cursorily, to use no harsher word, while by eliminating seven-eighths of them (which went to the British Museum) he rendered it difficult for

other mathematicians who subsequently examined them (even had they been animated by a historical spirit which did not belong to their generation), to ascertain what the real historical value of the writings might be.

Mr. Stevens thinks that he has given strong grounds for believing that great injustice has been done to Harriots as a mathematician ; but this cannot be admitted. There are many mathematicians who delight in conception but shrink before the labors of parturition. If Harriots was not one of these, he was, at any rate, prevented by other business from publishing his discoveries, of which, however, he seems to have made no secret. Scientific men, not wishing to be led astray from their own studies into difficult questions of the history of science, have adopted the handy rule that priority of publication must decide to whom a discovery belongs. This is just enough ; for if a man does not take the necessary trouble to give the world his own account of his discoveries, how does he merit a crown of glory for that which he has done for his own satisfaction? Justice, however, is not the question for the historian of science. He wishes to know whether, at a given stage of intellectual development, a given generalization was within the reach of a whole class of minds or only of one hero, and what form it would take in different minds. That Harriots followed Viète in algebra is unquestionable. His terminology and notation prove it ; and he himself acknowledges it. It is true that some of his scholars speak as if he had been in possession of some of Viète's methods before the latter published them in 1591 ; and this may be. It is hardly likely that his papers would show whether it were so or not. The achievement for which he has usually had the credit was the bringing all the terms of an equation to one side, and the regarding the quantic so obtained as a product of linear factors some one of which must vanish and furnish the solution. To have done this in the sixteenth century implies a high order of mathematical power. In addition to this, he is usually credited with the common method of finding rational roots of numerical equations, and with the general idea of resolving such equations by successive approximations. That is much. It is enough, in the judgment of most critics, to place him in the second rank of mathematicians—corresponding, let us say, to the rank of Horace, of Pope, of Wordsworth, of Lamartine, among poets. But this does not satisfy Mr. Stevens, who wishes him to be placed in the front rank—in the rank corresponding to Homer, Dante, Shakespeare, Goethe. But this is too much ; and Mr. Stevens simply does not know what it is that he asks. He reminds me of the fisherman who asked to have his wife made pope. Harriots plainly did not belong to the mental gender of the gigantic generalizers. He is said to have been the first to obtain the area of a spherical triangle ; and such is the sort of mathematical discovery which we might hope that the examination of his papers would bring to light. Certainly the Savilian Professor who reported about 1788 (not in 1802) against publishing some of the manuscripts, however sound the advice may have been under the particular circumstances existing at that juncture, gave an absurd reason for it when he said that they "could not con-

tribute to advance science." So the science of arithmetic was not advanced by the translation of the Rhind papyrus;—but the history of the human mind was greatly advanced. Rigand's later discussion of the question was too much in the same spirit. Merely for their probable mathematical interest, the papers would certainly repay the labor of examination.

Mr. Stevens rather timidly puts forth the suggestion that Harriots invented the telescope before Galileo. But Galileo is not now regarded as the first inventor of the instrument. Stevens does not seem to be aware that Leonard Digges's *Pantometria* first appeared in 1571, and that the combination of lenses there described could hardly have been actually made by an intelligent experimenter without his discovering the telescope. Now we know that Harriots in 1585 was showing the Indians in Virginia wonderful things with "perspective glasses." By a "perspective glass," at a somewhat later date, at any rate, was always understood a telescope; and in strictness nothing else ought to be so called. Still, even supposing that Harriots's perspective glass was a *camera obscura*, which Baptista Porta had described in 1558; yet when we find him making "perspective trunkes," which unquestionably were telescopes, in 1609, only about a year later than Hans Lippersley's application for a Dutch patent, and remember his habitual neglect to claim discoveries, for which his correspondents reproach him, it certainly does seem most probable that in examining the apparatus of that supposed *camera obscura*, he had observed phenomena which could not but lead a mind like his to making a telescope. It would be well worth while to examine his papers if only to find out how that was.

He observed the satellites of Jupiter so nearly at the same time as Galileo, that his papers ought to be carefully searched, in order to ascertain the precise date and circumstances of his first seeing them.

Moreover, it appears that Harriots was the first of the series of English atomists, a series embracing minds as widely discrepant as Harriots, Cudworth, Boyle, Shaftesbury, Hartley, Dalton, Maxwell. In other points, his philosophical opinions were original; but they remain obscure. This makes another urgent reason for a re-examination of his remains, to be followed, this time, by publication. America owes as much to Harriots as England does. Is she not as able to afford the ways and means—in learning and in money—for such a publication as the mother country, who has spent so much, and so gloriously, upon history?

But, of course, until those papers shall have been examined, nothing at all can be claimed for Harriots on the mere strength of probably exaggerated remarks by enthusiastic scholars addressing him in letters. Thus one of these, early in 1610, having just read Kepler's *De Motu Stellae Martis* says, "I remember long since you told me as much, that the motions of the planets were not perfect circles." Now, to have had that idea was certainly remarkable; but there is a million miles between that and Kepler's discovery, which Harriots could not possibly have made, since he was not in possession of Tycho's observations.

*Perkins: Richelieu and the Growth of French Power* 561

But Mr. Stevens's book makes it clear to us that the worth of the man did not lie in his mathematical and scientific genius, rate it as high as you can, but in his fine character, his perfect fidelity, his freedom from personal views. His will evinces the same business-like care with which, through life, he had performed all those of his duties to which selfishness could not urge him.

The volume is pretty. It is not surpassingly so; but then, when the printing was begun, we were not yet tired to death of the rather fanciful imitation of the sixteenth-century Roman type. There is an index which seems to have an entry for about every fifty words of the text. I forgot to mention that there is interesting information in the book about de Bry, Jacques LeMoyne, Captain John White, William Sander-son, Robert Hues, and others. But I am too ignorant of American history to venture upon that ground.

C. S. PEIRCE.

*Richelieu and the Growth of French Power.* By JAMES BRECK PERKINS, LL.D. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1900. Pp. xiii, 359.)

ABOUT fifteen years ago Mr. Perkins presented studies of the great Cardinal in his *France under Mazarin*. Although he modestly called these a "Review of the Administration of Richelieu" they treated the subject almost as extensively as the present work, but with less emphasis on the personal side of Richelieu's career. The biography is not to be considered a mere rewriting of the same material. A comparison of the two accounts shows that Mr. Perkins has approached the subject with opinions substantially unchanged, and yet with his thought of it controlled by additional years of investigation and reflection. Indeed, it is remarkable to how small an extent there are verbal similarities in the statement of what is necessarily the same matter. Since his previous work the publication of two volumes of M. Hanotaux's *Histoire du Cardinal de Richelieu*, a work which Mr. Perkins himself says "will remain the permanent record of the great Cardinal," has enabled Mr. Perkins to compare his own results upon the subject as far as 1618 with those of the distinguished French historian and statesman. The conception of the man in the pages of the two writers is not dissimilar. Upon one's first reading of Mr. Perkins's description of Richelieu's earlier career one feels that he has made the transformation of the Cardinal's conduct too abrupt at the time of his accession to power. The ambitious intriguer, who uses the bishopric of Luçon merely as a stepping-stone, and who is not above taking the attitude of fulsome and servile flattery towards the Queen-Mother, suddenly appears as the farsighted statesman, who was selfish, it is true, but only because he had determined to be himself the instrument of carrying into effect his designs. A second reading shows this to be a carefully worked out conception of Richelieu's career. Hanotaux puts the matter in this way: "Jusque-là, il avait marché, contraint et courbé, dans les avenues de l'ambition et de l'intrigue. À peine au pouvoir, sa taille se redresse," etc.

Like all Mr. Perkins's other works on France this is a reader's book ; it lures one on from paragraph to paragraph and chapter to chapter. The student who is interested in the administrative side of the period may quarrel with the arrangement of matter which hides away important administrative changes among other things of less moment. For example, the explanation of the larger use of intendants during Richelieu's administration is crowded in between remarks on public education and upon the rise of the press. There is room for a difference of opinion upon the relative importance of such matters, but there is hardly any phenomenon of French political life of greater moment than the rigorous subordination of local authorities to the central government, and so the causes of this system are particularly interesting. Occasionally it seems that Mr. Perkins must be studying the seventeenth century from the standpoint of later times, rather than from that of the historic development of the French administrative and economic system. He refers to the exemption of the land of the nobility from the *taille* as if this were surprising, but not two centuries had elapsed since the king had taken from the nobility their ancient right to the *taille*. It was too early for the nobility to be asked to become themselves *taillable*. In giving Richelieu credit for his successful attempts to build an effective navy Mr. Perkins somewhat exaggerates the power of the fleet which was constructed. He says, "Probably it could have met on equal terms the navy of any other European nation." But this was the period of the greatest effectiveness of the Dutch fleet, which, according to Captain Mahan, remained until 1674 equal to the French and English fleets combined. These are minor matters which in no way affect the interest or the value of the book as a biography of Richelieu.

HENRY E. BOURNE.

*Oliver Cromwell.* By JOHN MORLEY, M.P. (New York : Century Company. 1900. Pp. xiv, 486.)

*Oliver Cromwell.* By THEODORE ROOSEVELT. (New York : Charles Scribner's Sons. 1900. Pp. x, 260.)

MR. MORLEY'S book is the result of very careful study ranging over the whole field of Cromwellian literature. He shows not only that thorough acquaintance with the writings of Mr. Gardiner and Mr. Firth which is indispensable to everyone who now approaches the subject, but he has tested their conclusions by an examination of so much of the source material as has been printed and is easily accessible. His labors have been so indefatigable that where he differs in opinion from these two "giants of research" we may assume that the difference is intentional and in no case due to mere carelessness. Such thoroughness is a remarkable achievement for so busy a man as Mr. Morley, but it has an inevitable limitation. It is manifestly impossible for even a Morley to examine *all* the sources for the period without giving up his life to the task, or even to examine *all* the sources bearing upon merely the more im-

portant problems which constantly pressed upon him for solution. In just so far, therefore, his conclusions will rest upon insecure foundations. Mr. Morley's variations from the conclusions of Mr. Gardiner and Mr. Firth are numerous and are in general in the way of disparagement of Cromwell's motives. In the case of the Self-Denying Ordinance, both Mr. Gardiner and Mr. Firth look upon Cromwell's actions as straightforward and sincere, while to Mr. Morley they appear "oblique." Mr. Morley is also not entirely convinced of Cromwell's complete ignorance of the proposed disbanding of Barebone's Parliament. Since Mr. Morley's conclusions have the disadvantage of resting upon more or less incomplete information, he will not take it ill if they are forced to run the gauntlet of a somewhat severer scrutiny than would otherwise be the case. In general, it may be said that those who know Cromwell best have the most favorable opinion of both his sincerity and his intentions.

Mr. Morley has the true historian's gift of sympathy. Not only Cromwell but the minor characters are real and move in the real world of the seventeenth century. It is seldom indeed that an incident is taken out of its historical setting and judged by modern standards. One case may be mentioned where something very like this took place, where the full weight of Cromwell's mistaken Irish policy is thrown upon his own shoulders, whereas Mr. Morley himself knows well that Cromwell was in this as in so many of his mistakes a typical Englishman of his time. But in general it may be said that Mr. Morley has satisfactorily solved the difficult task of giving to his figure a historical background.

Mr. Morley's historical method differs in two particulars from that of the more severe school of modern historians. He looks at history from a strongly moral point of view. He still believes that it is the province of the historian not merely to explain but to administer praise and blame. Some of the most interesting passages in the book are in answer to Carlyle, who also praised and blamed, but erratically. The historian of the present day is inclined to look askance at such judgments, because of the danger one runs of trying former ages by the standards of our own. He is not so much concerned to pass judgment on the righteousness of an historical action, as he is anxious correctly to understand it. If he can explain just what happened, why it happened, and what consequences followed, he is satisfied. In the case of Mr. Morley, furthermore, the interests of the statesman sometimes control the interests of the historian, and even color his views. Current questions of English politics, the Irish question, imperialism, appear furtively in his pages, and few of his readers will wish them gone. They offer a departure, however, from the severer historical method of exposition, since they are usually not history but politics. This is intended, however, merely as a distinction, not as a criticism.

Mr. Morley must be pleased with the way in which the publishers have done their part. It is a book of rare beauty, filled with some sixty well-executed portraits. The general literary public, for whom the work is primarily intended, will be delighted by the breadth of view, the im-

partial judgment and finished style which it has learned to expect in Mr. Morley's books. The historian will read it with pleasure and profit, but the serious student will return with undiminished loyalty to his Gardiner and his Firth.

One does not read many pages in Mr. Roosevelt's book without grave misgivings. The only authorities he sees fit to mention are Macaulay and Carlyle. Nothing is said of Mr. Gardiner or of Mr. Firth, whose writings it may be said with hardly an exaggeration, have superseded all others. Mr. Roosevelt might plead, to be sure, that life is short and Gardiner is long, but the obvious answer would be that anyone who has not time to read and re-read Mr. Gardiner's delightful though voluminous pages has not time to write a life of Cromwell. It would be rash to assert that Mr. Roosevelt has not read them, but it is safe to say that he has done so to no particular purpose. To him, Laud is a "small narrow man" with a "silly" policy of enforced uniformity. Wentworth is a traitor to the Parliamentary cause who "had obtained his price" from the King. Cromwell is a noble man whose early promise was blasted by personal ambition, "cursed with a love of power."

Mr. Roosevelt is ill at ease in the seventeenth century. It is in fact a hard century to understand since it is enough like our own to mislead us continually by false analogies. But Mr. Roosevelt's method of avoiding the difficulty by substituting the modern analogy in every case and arguing quietly upon that, is the worst possible. The book may in fact be described as a slight thread of Cromwellian narrative, taken from more or less old-fashioned writers, explained and amplified by references to Mr. Roosevelt's own experiences and to events of American history, especially of recent American history. Sometimes the analogies are utterly misleading, sometimes the transitions are so sudden and unexpected as to border upon the comic. One does not get far in the following without exclaiming, "The Germans of New York!" "The Puritan fashion for regulating, not merely the religion, but the morals and the manners of their neighbors, especially in the matter of Sunday observance and pastimes generally, was peculiarly exasperating to men of a more easy-going nature. Even nowadays, the effort for practical reform in American city government is rendered immeasurably more difficult by the fact that a considerable number of the best citizens are prone to devote their utmost energies, not to striving for the fundamentals of social morality, civic honesty, and good government, but, in accordance with their own theory of propriety of conduct, to preventing other men from pursuing what these latter regard as innocent pleasures; while, on the other hand, a large number of good citizens, in their irritation at any interference with what they feel to be legitimate pastimes, welcome the grossest corruption of misrule rather than submit to what they call 'Puritanism.'" This is harmless enough. A much more serious case is where Cromwell's constitutional difficulties are compared to those of Washington and Lincoln and he is judged harshly for not ruling as constitutionally as they did. One will look long for a book in which one

period of history is so systematically judged by the light of another. To Mr. Roosevelt, recent progress may be summed up in the two phrases religious and political liberty, and he looks at every event of the seventeenth century through these spectacles. The result is a distinct curiosity in historical literature. Externally, the book is a handsome volume, uniform in binding with the author's *Rough Riders*. It has numerous illustrations, for the most part interesting and well chosen, though the propriety of including fanciful battle-scenes by a modern illustrator may well be questioned.

GUERNSEY JONES.

*Napoleon: The Last Phase.* By Lord ROSEBERY. (New York : Harper and Brothers. 1901. Pp. 284.)

To read a book by an Englishman which treats without prejudice the *dirus Hannibal* of Great Britain yields one a novel pleasure. After Waterloo, Napoleon's life presents little which interests the student of his greater deeds ; for except to check off historical misstatements, the sifting of the years in St. Helena is barren. Yet Lord Rosebery has made a readable volume by his discrimination in awarding praise and blame. Except for short digressions on the great Corsican's loss of balance by superhuman successes, on his "supreme regrets," and on the estimate of man, ruler and captain, Lord Rosebery confines himself to a marshalling of evidence, and a description of the *dramatis personae*. He handles Sir Hudson Lowe, that "unfit representative of Britain," without gloves. Living in the only good residence on the island, with a salary of £12,000 a year, "hapless and distracted Lowe" was a childish, petty tyrant of the great prisoner in his charge, for the maintenance of whose *entourage* of fifty-one people in a collection of huts which had been constructed as a cattle-shed, a paltry £8,000 was awarded—though later this pittance was increased. "There are few names in history so unfortunate as Lowe's." His absence of gentlemanly instincts and his quarrelsome ness made a difficult situation intolerable, and covered him with ridicule worse than ignominy.

Of Napoleon's suite each member is fairly characterized : sympathetic Grand Marshal Bertrand and his lovely wife ; the voluminous, Boswellian, but mysterious and unreliable Las Cases ; suave Montholon, the blind devotee ; mendacious Antomarchi, the physician, and O'Meara, M.D., of the long and worthless book ; that "fretful porcupine" Gourgaud, whose impertinences, because of his devotion, Napoleon so patiently overlooked, and who in his lachrymose diary has unwittingly given us a picture of the Emperor in his last years "almost brutal in its raw realism." What has been written of this period also comes in for criticism : War- den's literary inventiveness, the fabrications of Santini, the so-called *Letters from the Cape*, Lady Malcolm's *Conversations from Napoleon* and others. Scott's estimate of the great man is weighed and found wanting. If only for its culling-out of historical myths and lies, the book would have a distinct value.

The picture of Napoleon is faithful. Retaining his power of fascination so that even the crews of the ships which deported him grew fond of the man, and that every visitor felt its influence ; insisting on his ancient ceremonial until his aides and attendants almost dropped from the fatigue of standing ; dining on gold and silver plate, though he finished the meal in twenty minutes' time ; driving with coach and six—though indeed the roads of St. Helena accounted for this ; reading voraciously the books supplied him, among which the Bible (not from religious motives however), Homer, Aeschylus, Euripides, and other classics were prominent ; like Voltaire's Candide, digging in his garden, and obliging all about him to lend a hand ; never unoccupied, but always ineffably bored ; growing fat and pudgy and careless of his dress, yet in bearing still "the Emperor," we see, from Lord Rosebery's résumé, the man as he actually was, up to the day when cancer of the stomach ended his abnormal career.

The farce is detailed of the French, Austrian and Russian Commissioners, charged "to assure themselves of Napoleon's presence," and yet unable to get a sight of him, so sedulously did he keep within his own domain ; and a sketch is given of "amorous Montchenu," a "mountebank" Napoleon called him ; of Balmain, the dignified and amiable Russian, who alone had orders (from his master Alexander) to show Napoleon "les égards personnels qu'on lui doit ;" of the neutral Austrian Stürmer. Their quarrels with Lowe were constant ; and though it was a physical impossibility for Napoleon to escape, both they and Sir Hudson were ever ridden by the nightmare of such an event.

Napoleon had been crowned as Emperor by the Pope and accepted as such by all Europe ; yet on his deportation he was ordered to be treated as "a general out of employment ;" and to this low rank his St. Helena gaoler would fain have degraded him. But Napoleon rose superior to this affront. In every instance where Lowe matched himself against Napoleon's dignity, he lost. Yet Napoleon's personal bearing towards Lowe was "imperturbably calm," writes Lavalette, only on rare occasions descending to any expression of indignation.

Overbearing enough in his years of success, captivity appears to have brought out Napoleon's native amiability. Even Gourgaud's impudent reply : "Yes, Sire, provided that history does not say that France was very great before Napoleon, but was partitioned after him," was passed over in silence. A caged animal, "gagged and paralyzed by Europe because his was too gigantic a force," he lapsed into neither ferocity nor laziness.

Lord Rosebery deems Roederer's report of Napoleon's conversations to be the most exact. "Concise, frank, sometimes brutal, but always interesting" was the Emperor's real talk. Las Cases pads, Montholon lacks intelligence ; O'Meara translates ; Gourgaud painted him from one standpoint.

So unduly sensitive to English newspaper criticism that he learned a little English in order to understand it, yet Napoleon never caught its spirit. There was no lapse in intellectual ability, but it took shape solely in talk, for he had dictated so many years that he quite lost his power to

use a pen. His views of what he might have accomplished in the Orient by heading a Mahometan movement were vastly exaggerated. His supreme regret was that he had not fallen at Borodino or Waterloo—death on the field would have rounded his career.

Not lacking in kindly virtues, Napoleon, though he possessed devoted followers, had no friends. As Emperor, his test of friendship was utility; afterwards it was too late to create friendships. As with most very great men, the world either worshipped or hated him.

Lord Rosebery's summary, in the last chapter, of Napoleon's character and powers is strong and judicious. That he so markedly overcomes his English prejudices reminds one that the century, in the first years of which Napoleon rose to supreme power, has passed away. In a recent article in the *Atlantic* Dr. Goldwin Smith gives us the old-fashioned British view, and its bitterness stands out in marked contrast to Lord Rosebery's equipoise.

The book is luxuriously made up, the paper being almost inconveniently thick; the type is large and clear; and the manufacture worthy of the distinguished author and great subject.

THEODORE AYRAULT DODGE.

*Daniel O'Connell and the Revival of National Life in Ireland.* By

ROBERT DUNLOP, M.A. [“Heroes of the Nations” Series.]

(G. P. Putnam's Sons: New York and London. 1900. Pp. xv, 393.)

This volume appears to the present reviewer to be fully up to, but not above, the average of this series. We are not justified in looking to publications of this kind for additions to our knowledge, and none such seems to be attempted here. But it is a clear and interesting treatment, based apparently on a considerable knowledge of the secondary material and on some work with the sources, O'Connell's letters and speeches being used with good effect. The critic will be somewhat embarrassed by the total absence of all references or bibliographical indications, and in connection with this it might be said that even if the writers in this series are debarred from foot-notes, there seems no good reason why a slight sketch of the material used should not be given in some other part of the volume. The amount of space thus taken would be imperceptible, and it is difficult to see that even the most delicate sensibilities would be unpleasantly affected.

The author's treatment is closely chronological. Although written with strong Irish sympathies, the narrative is usually an impartial one, and little indication is given of personal, political, or religious views. The reviewer indeed feels that justice is scarcely done Peel, but is ready to believe that what seems to him somewhat misleading references are due rather to inadequate study of the Peel papers and to limited space than to any wilful blindness to Peel's energy and earnestness in Irish affairs. O'Connell's principles and methods are brought out very clearly;

on the other hand the writer fails to bring strongly before us his personality, or to fully explain his wonderful power over the Irish people. Another weak side of the book is its failure to bring clearly before us the actual conditions in Ireland either when O'Connell began his work or when he ended it. Neither land nor electoral conditions are explained; there is little or no definite explanation of administrative institutions or methods; we are not shown fully what "Emancipation" meant or what still was lacking after it had been achieved; except in regard to national spirit, we get little information as to development of any kind. The book is further somewhat lacking in perspective; the hero is not put in a satisfactory historical setting, and the general appreciations are weak.

The author declares in his preface that the volume "is not offered to the public as a mere verbal expansion of the article I contributed a few years ago to the *Dictionary of National Biography*." The reviewer is unable to concur in this statement, for it seems to him that the book is clearly but little more than a "verbal expansion" of that excellent article, and that he will not be misleading anyone in asserting that nearly as much will be got from the article of eighteen pages as from this volume of 389. The effort to popularize to which the author has given himself seems to consist mainly in diluting the earlier treatment with matter of a journalistic order got largely from the notes to Fitzpatrick's *Correspondence of Daniel O'Connell* (New York, 1888, two vols.); and it seems proper to call attention to the peculiar *verbatim* manner in which much of this gossipy material is borrowed, though without any reference whatever to Fitzpatrick. This will be best shown by putting some extracts in parallel columns:

## Dunlop.

P. 20. (O'Connell's marriage.) This displeased his uncle Maurice "who in fact had already singled out a suitable partner for him in the person of Miss Mary Ann Healy, a mature spinster of short stature, but remarkably long purse and nose. Indeed so seriously did her personal appearance threaten to damage her matrimonial prospects, that in making his will her father thought it only right to increase her portion expressly 'on account of her nose.'"

P. 152. (Mission to London, 1825.) "the deputation attracted considerable attention in passing

## Fitzpatrick.

I. p. 12:—"Miss Healey was a mature spinster, short in stature, but famous for her long purse—and nose. This organ threatened to militate so gravely against the future prospects of the lady, that her uncle, when writing his will, was urged to make her fortune larger 'on account of her nose.'"

I. 95:—"The Irish political missionaries, as they wended their way through England, attracted

through the principal towns on their route, especially O'Connell, who in his large cloak—a survival to all appearance of the ancient Irish mantle—formed a conspicuous object on the box of the landau."

much attention, especially in the smaller towns. We learn from contemporary account that O'Connell mainly arrested the public gaze. He sat on the box of a landau with a large cloak—seemingly a revival of the ancient Irish mantle—folded around him."

We need not delay on the question whether the popularizer owes anything to those whom he despoils. Here the object is rather to show that the author has not done the kind and quantity of additional work that we are justified in looking for. The expansion of the brief biographical sketch into the volume which should adequately represent O'Connell as the "Hero" of the Irish nation, would seem to have called for not only the popularizing element that is here supplied, but more especially such a fuller consideration of Irish conditions and development in connection with the hero's work as should adequately show the connections between them, and leave us with a clearer conception of what the hero and his work represent in Irish and British history.

Another very considerable element in this "expansion" is large quotations from O'Connell's papers and speeches. This is entirely praiseworthy, but the method employed is by no means satisfactory. Apart from the fact that no references whatever are given for such extracts, and that the exact dates are most irritatingly missing, the author reproduces this matter in the third person, though at a length usually as great as if it had been given in O'Connell's exact language.

In spite of these defects the book will be a useful one. It is clear and pleasant reading, is accurate and well-arranged (Fitzpatrick's somewhat confused and gossipy compilation is occasionally straightened out), and is animated by fair spirit and by generous though not extreme enthusiasm. The illustrations are helpful (a map of Ireland should have been included), and the index passably good. VICTOR COFFIN.

*The Forward Policy and its Results, or Thirty-five Years' Work amongst the Tribes on Our North-Western Frontier of India.*  
By RICHARD ISAAC BRUCE, C.I.E., formerly Political Agent, Belúchistán, late Commissioner and Superintendent, Derajat Division, Punjab, India. (London : Longmans, Green and Co. 1900. Pp. xxviii, 382.)

*Eighteen Years in the Khyber, 1879-1898.* By Col. Sir ROBERT WARBURTON, K.C.I.E., C.S.I. (London : John Murray. 1900. Pp. [18], 351.)

THE Indian Frontier question is not a new one, nor have the problems connected with it received final solution, yet these two books will

do much to clarify the subject, for both are by men who know whereof they write. Mr. Bruce was the assistant and right-hand man of Sir Robert Sandeman and his book is, therefore, in great part a record of events already made familiar in Thornton's *Life of Sandeman*. The story of Mr. Bruce's life in India from 1862 to 1896 is one full of adventure and rich in political experience. Tribal management on the lines laid down by Sir Robert Sandeman was unknown when Bruce was first appointed to a frontier district at Dera Ghazi Khan under the Punjab government. The system then in force was that of Lord Lawrence; the main idea was that British officers were never to cross the border on official business, that they were to avoid every step tending to extend the frontier and that in the event of disturbance beyond British jurisdiction a punitive expedition was to be made if the case demanded. It has been called the Close-Border system, for non-intervention beyond the frontier was the maxim. In the Punjab a conciliatory policy modified the stringency of these rules but in Sind the protection of the frontier depended to a great extent upon a military force. Sandeman ended this in Baluchistán by his success in negotiating a treaty with the Khan of Khelát in 1876. His policy has been described as a "system of conciliatory intervention tempered by lucrative employment and light taxation." Mr. Bruce defends this plan as a policy of civilization and as the true and just method of stopping local frontier disorder and of protecting India when the great day of invasion threatens. He describes in detail the workings of the system, being so enthusiastic as to claim that it could be enforced among tribes other than Balúch; and, in fact, he denies that there is any essential difference between Balúch and Patán and says they are both "open and amenable to the same influences" (p. 19). It has usually been held by other writers that there is a sharp distinction to be drawn between the two, that the Balúch is aristocratic, bowing to the decision of his chief, rarely influenced by religious bigotry, and not apt to join in fanatic outbreaks, and, on the other hand, that the Patán is more democratic, often refusing to obey his chief, who at best is only the head of the dominant faction in the tribe, and listening to priestly incitement to *Jihad*, the *Mullah* being often more powerful than the chief. The council or *Jirga* of the tribe in Patán territory is therefore a more factional body than in Baluchistán. Mr. Bruce bases his belief upon personal experience, but the weight of authority is against him.

During the years 1876 to 1888, when Mr. Bruce was with Sir Robert Sandeman in Baluchistán he assisted in the pacification of the Khanate of Khelát, in the opening of trade routes long closed but which were now to be guarded by former plunderers, in the creation of Quetta as an outpost of empire, and in the administration of Baluchistán, then enjoying its first decade of law and order. The last eight years of his service Mr. Bruce spent as Commissioner in Derajat division under the Punjab government. He had opportunity, therefore, to judge frontier affairs from all sides, and his conclusions in the larger political issues are the more interesting when we examine the opinions of another writer serving on

a different post and trained in a different school. Colonel Warburton, the warden of the Khaibar Pass, had if possible a more exciting career than did Mr. Bruce. His mother was an Afghan lady, a niece of Dost Muhammad, Amir of Afghanistan, and his rare insight and ready sympathy in native affairs may be counted as among his greatest gifts. His period of service was marked by great changes ; it was his honor to hold the famous Khaibar pass open to trade and travel "without a single European soldier or Sepoy being stationed in it beyond Jamrud." He left Peshawar before the outbreak in 1897, but believed that he could have checked the tribesmen and kept the pass open in spite of *Mullah* fanaticism if he had remained on the ground ; and his chapter on the subject is entitled "the Khyber débâcle." As regards the cause of this frontier war Colonel Warburton is not explicit, for he says that within three months of the outbreak there was no disturbing factor, and though he tells the story of the Turkish agent at Cabul, he does not give it much credence. Religious bigotry and personal ambition seem to have been the most important causes, though both he and Mr. Bruce object to the theory of a premeditated united attack all along the border. The literary style of both writers is that of the man who lives in the open. Mr. Bruce disarms criticism by frankly acknowledging his faults and Colonel Warburton did not live to revise his proofs. Repetition is common, and in the case of Mr. Bruce the reader grows weary at the minute record of the multitudinous "thanks of the Government of India." The happy day of uniform and reasonable spelling seems to be far off if we are to judge by the divergent methods here shown ; and, since Sir William Hunter has given us a system which is at least workable, it is to be regretted that Indian officials should be unwilling to take pity on the reader, and should refuse to be orthodox in their spelling of Indian names.

In the matter of general policy Colonel Warburton is as emphatic as Mr. Bruce in declaring the old Punjab method to be a failure ; they defend the character of the tribesmen and claim that by having the right men in charge the entire frontier can be peaceably handled ; they deplore the use of the native *Arbab* or middleman in dealing with trans-frontier tribes, pleading for a single-headed frontier commission which shall do away with inconsistency and vacillation. The plan in vogue in the Punjab to-day appears to regard the punitive expedition with its rewards for the military leaders as a natural result of the Forward Policy ; in the meantime the "political" who maintains the peace along his section of the border is passed by. From another point of view the present policy is *prima facie* totally inadequate ; and it is much more expensive than that advocated by Colonel Warburton, whether it really be the Sandeman system supported by Mr. Bruce, or some modification of it. Civilization and frontier defense as well as the Indian budget would then be well served.

ALFRED L. P. DENNIS.

*The Peace Conference at the Hague and its Bearings on International Law and Policy.* By FREDERICK W. HOLLS, D.C.L. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1900. Pp. xxiv, 572.)

THE author of this book is a member of the New York bar and was secretary of the delegation from the United States to the Peace Conference at the Hague. He is described on the title-page as "a member of the Conference," which is not exact, for while he was permitted to take part in its discussions he had no authority to sign on behalf of our government. Nevertheless he was active in the work of the Conference and represented the United States in the *Comité d'Examen* which framed the Convention for the peaceful adjustment of international differences. He tells us that at a critical stage of the proceedings, when the reluctance of the German government to co-operate in the establishment of a permanent court of arbitration seemed likely to wreck the Conference, he accompanied Dr. Zorn of the German delegation to Berlin, consulted with Prince Hohenlohe and Count von Bülow, and succeeded in averting the crisis. It would certainly seem therefore, from a perusal of his book, that no one of the persons present, certainly none of those representing the government of the United States, had better opportunities than the author for observing what passed at the Hague and for learning the true motives that actuated the several governments.

Unfortunately, Mr. Holls has felt bound to observe a very disappointing silence on many of the topics upon which he might have been expected to be most interesting and instructive. It is apparent that in relating the history of the Conference he has been hampered at every turn by what he calls "the necessarily restricted limits open to members." Nor does this embarrassment exhibit itself only in the rather significant omissions from his narrative. It is even more apparent in the tone of eager, one might almost say indiscriminate, eulogy, bestowed upon every person and thing connected with the Conference. The building in which it met, the arrangements for conducting business, the luncheons set before the delegates, the handwriting of the Final Act, are all in turn the subjects of enthusiastic praise. This man's speech is "most eloquent and brilliant," the other man's is "of great force and beauty." This delegate is distinguished by "noble idealism," the next by "sound judgment," the next by "unerring prudence," the next by "perfection of decision and tact." The only unamiable word for which the author finds occasion, except when he speaks of those who thought ill of the Conference, is in connection with the Fourth of July celebration at Delft. He is compelled to admit that upon that day the weather was "inclement"; but he makes amends by adding that it "moderated" in the afternoon.

The author has also apparently considered that the limits of his work could not with propriety be extended so as to embrace any events occurring since the adjournment of the Conference. He has not even informed us of the fate of any of the measures adopted by it. Three "Conventions" and three "Declarations" were voted by a majority of the Powers

represented, but each of these six proposed contracts expressly provided that they might be signed at a later date by any of the other parties. Neither the second convention, with respect to the laws and customs of war on land, nor the third convention, for the adaptation to maritime warfare of the Geneva Convention of August 22, 1864, was signed at the time by the United States, or by Germany, or Austria, or Great Britain. Have they been signed or ratified since. Mr. Holls does not tell us. And why did these, the chief naval and military powers of the world, then decline to join in these important treaties?

So with respect to the first and most important convention, for the peaceful adjustment of international differences. The fact is (although it is not stated in Mr. Holls's book) that that convention has now been ratified by all the powers which were represented at the Conference, except China, Greece, Luxemburg, Mexico, Persia, Servia, Switzerland, Turkey and Bulgaria. This curious agglomeration of non-Christian and weak Christian nations must have some significance. Why did these particular countries delay giving a final assent to a treaty which was designed to substitute justice and reason in the place of force? And why did the strongest and most warlike nations so readily accept it?

Such are some of the questions which Mr. Holls's book suggests, and which he has apparently thought himself bound to leave unanswered. It is the more to be regretted, because he is evidently competent to deal with these subjects, as his interesting work clearly shows. If we criticize it, it is because there is not more of it.

The purpose of the book, as declared in the preface, is to give "the story of the Conference and a description of its work" especially for American and English readers. Accordingly, the author in his first two chapters gives an account of the calling of the Conference and of its first meeting. The text of the official circulars of invitation is given in full, as are also the ceremonial addresses at the opening. A complete list of the members, with brief biographical notes as to each, should prove useful.

The next three chapters deal in turn with the work of the three committees into which the conference divided itself. The recommendations of the several committees are considered point by point, and are elucidated by the author's comments and explanations, and by copious extracts from the discussions in committee or in the full Conference. The sixth chapter relates the unsuccessful efforts made by the delegates from the United States to secure action upon the question of immunity of private property upon the high seas, a subject upon which agreement proved impossible, and which was "referred to a future Conference." These four chapters are the best in the book. The comments and debates on the various provisions recommended are vivid and instructive, and indeed are essential to a clear understanding of what was accomplished.

The seventh chapter treats of "The Conference from Day to Day," and the eighth chapter closes the book with a discussion as to the bearings of the Conference upon international law and policy. In an ap-

pendix, the full text of all the conventions, declarations and final resolutions are given in the original French, accompanied by a careful English translation in parallel columns; also the full text of the reports made by the individual members of the American delegation, the report of the delegation itself to the Secretary of State, and finally, the addresses delivered at the tomb of Grotius in the Great Church of Delft on the rainy Fourth of July, 1899.

Looking at the tangible results of the Conference, one is naturally led to ask what is likely to be the practical value of its work. Mr. Holls answers the question without the very least hesitation. He "frankly avows his conviction that the peace Conference accomplished a great and glorious result, not only in the humanizing of warfare and the codification of the laws of war, but, above all, in the promulgation of the Magna Charta of International Law." He believes that a long first step has been taken towards the establishment of a system that will substitute law for force in international relations; and that, as a result, "the glamour of the supposed strength of reactionary government, or of the comforts of superstition will be gone, Faith will revive, the 'struggle of the soul' will be won, and general discontent, the basis of all unrest, must correspondingly diminish."

One may be permitted to doubt whether these tremendous results are likely to be achieved, even if all the recommendations of the Conference meet with general and loyal support; but that its recommendations may be made to produce permanent results of great value, is, no doubt, highly probable. The most striking and beneficent feature of the proposed agreement is to be found in the fact that the signatory Powers in effect declare that no war can hereafter be justified until good offices and mediation and arbitration have all been tried and have all failed. No one can as yet foresee how effectual this declaration will prove. But if the work of the Conference shall only tend to turn public attention in times of excitement towards the means by which war may honorably be averted,—if it only serves to point out several paths by which contending nations may find a way to peace,—it will have accomplished a task for which all nations may rightly praise it.

It remains only to be said of the book under review that it is well printed, is reasonably free from typographical errors,—*procès verbaux* being perhaps the worst,—and that it is furnished with an adequate index.

GEORGE L. RIVES.

*Cabot Bibliography, with an Introductory Essay on the Careers of the Cabots, based upon an Independent Examination of the Sources of Information.* By GEORGE PARKER WINSHIP. (New York: Dodd, Mead and Co.; London: Henry Stevens, Son and Stiles. 1900. Pp. lii, 180.)

THIS handsome volume is an expansion of Mr. Winship's "Bibliography" published in 1897. Every student of early American history

will be glad of an index so complete and a guide so judicious to the much vexed subject of the Cabots and their voyages. Coming at the close of an active controversy it will be welcomed as a summary of the voluminous literature in English, French, German, Italian, Spanish and Portuguese concerning the event which gave to the English race an inchoate title to Northern America.

The introductory essay sets forth concisely that which the author conceives to be the solid residue of fact remaining over from a controversy of fifty years. It is written in the true historic spirit and with method and clearness. The numbers along the margins of the pages are those of the articles in the *Bibliography* which are considered to establish the conclusions in the text. Mr. Winship, however, brings out more strongly than any other English writer the probability of another voyage by Sebastian Cabot to the northeast coast of America in 1507 or 1508. This point has not been sufficiently elucidated and he is right in dwelling upon it, especially in the light of the report made by Marcantonio Contarini to the Venetian senate in 1536 (Art. 80). The ill-fated expedition to the La Plata is treated with much insight. The moral character of Sebastian Cabot is summed up with historic sanity, as that of an ordinary man of his day and generation—not an anachronistic, evangelical saint on the one hand, nor a perfidious liar and traitor on the other. The celebrated map of 1544 is discussed and its evidence as to the landfall of 1497 having been on Cape Breton Island is accepted as conclusive. In short Mr. Winship adopts the rules of practice of every law court and accepts one piece of definite, positive evidence as outweighing a wilderness of negative and contradictory conjecture. His reasons, however, for supposing that Sebastian Cabot, on his return to England, took up his residence at Bristol are not apparent.

The main body of the volume is the *Bibliography*, and that is divided into a bibliography of "sources" (or of writers before the year 1600) and of later or secondary authorities, including all the controversialists of recent years. The articles are numbered consecutively for easy reference, and the works cited have evidently been examined with care and are described with accuracy. The notes appended are very valuable and contain an impartial estimate of each work and, in the case of larger and more general treatises, references to the pages where the Cabot matter may be found. The *Bibliography* is as complete as such a work can possibly be. Some of the articles in popular magazines and newspapers during the Cabot celebration year might perhaps have been omitted, but in such a work fulness is an error on the right side. On the other hand mention might have been made of Champlain, and certainly it is due to Charlevoix. The edition of Navarrete's *Voyages* in quarto is the one usually found in large libraries, but there is also a later edition in octavo which is deserving of mention as is also D'Avezac's *Examen Critique* of Nicholl's life of Sebastian Cabot in the *Revue Critique d'Histoire* of April, 1870, which has been published separately. One reference, however, we do miss—the three-cent postage stamp of Newfoundland; for it

not only declares Bonavista to have been the landfall in 1497 but it gives a picture of the spot. This is the first instance of what may be called the "philatelic method" in history. It is heroic and disposes summarily of Gordian knots.

Some of the notes suggest remark. In Art. 374 there is a slip (probably in transcription), for Haliburton gives Trinity Bay, Newfoundland, as the landfall, not Nova Scotia. The note on Article 89 (the Descliers map) follows Mr. Coote's opinion that the map shows the results of Cartier's *first* voyage; but Mr. Harrisse was unquestionably right, in the discussion which followed its publication by Lord Crawford. It really contains all the results of Cartier's *second* voyage. There is also a misleading note at Art. 218 (Thorne's map) referring the legend solely to the Labrador coast. This map is in Hakluyt's *Divers Voyages*. There is a reproduction of it in the *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada* for 1897 at p. 192 and it will be seen at once upon inspection that the legend covers the coast from latitude 40° northwards. The La Cosa map (Art. 84) hardly receives the attention due to its importance. Mr. Ganong (Art. 359) is entitled to the entire credit of having first demonstrated that the Island of St. John in the 1544 map was not intended for Prince Edward Island, but for the Magdalen group, and, in Art. 398, it would have been more precise to have said that the Rev. Moses Harvey was the *first* to suggest the quadri-centennial of 1897, omitting the word "among."

Trifling matters such as these found after a close perusal of a volume containing so many thousands of references and critical estimations over the immense extent of the Cabot literature, establish the painstaking accuracy of this most valuable book. Every Cabot scholar should have it and if he should at any time be reproached with the unpractical nature of his studies he may refer to Art. 549 and point out that the rights of property abutting on the public streets of New York depend upon the common law of England and not on the Roman Dutch law *for the reason that John Cabot antedated Henry Hudson.*

S. E. DAWSON.

*The Clergy in American Life and Letters.* By DANIEL DULANY ADDISON. (New York and London: The Macmillan Co. 1900. Pp. ix, 400.)

THERE are no publishers in America more worthily respected than the Macmillan Company. There is no American scholar or man of letters more deservedly eminent than Professor Woodberry, of Columbia University. And among our younger Episcopal clergy, of the more liberal kind, there is none more energetic and devoted than the Reverend Daniel Dulany Addison. No book, then, could have a much happier origin than one which should proceed from his authorship, through the editorship of Professor Woodberry, to the lists of the Macmillans.

Whoever takes up *The Clergy in American Life and Letters*, with the agreeable anticipations thus excited, must feel, as he turns the pages, a growing sense of disappointment. In plain truth, the book proves to be

among the most salient pieces of evidence, if evidence were needed, of the mischief done both to scholarship and to authorship, not to speak of literature, by the prevalent custom of publication in hastily pre-arranged series. The precise genesis of this work, is, of course, a matter of conjecture. On general principles, one would infer from the result that the publishers, desirous of increasing their usefulness by the evocation of some "National Studies in American Letters," sensibly selected as editor of the series a scholarly essayist and poet, unquestionably among the few living Americans whose writings may be expected to survive; and that thereupon, being very busy and enterprising publishers, they confided the "National Studies" to his care. One would infer, furthermore, that this editor, himself among the most busy and stimulating professors of a university whose reputation is deservedly more than national, found his primary duties so absorbing as perforce to limit the time which he could devote to merely editorial labors; and so that, having selected for this "Study" an author whose character and ability justly commanded his confidence, he found himself unable to assist this author with any considerable supervision or suggestion. One would infer, finally, that this author, who had somewhat inadvertently agreed to finish his book at a fixed time, honestly did his best; but that his manifold distractions as a parish priest left him no leisure for such prolonged, concentrated mental processes as seem generally needful for the development of an intellectual conception into organic vitality. Such things are bound to happen when even the best of men find themselves in the grip of a series. Unless some such thing happened in this case, Mr. Addison's *Clergy* is incomprehensible. Undoubtedly it is so gentle in spirit, that to speak of it ungently seems heartless. The milk of human kindness exudes from every page. Whatever the case with students or readers, Mr. Addison may sleep nightly with a conscience void of offence towards any man concerning whom he has written. When one has said this, however, one has almost exhausted the commendation which is compatible with conscientious criticism.

According to the preface, "the book does not aim to be either exhaustive or encyclopaedic, but to give a general view of the literary work of those who, by their religious calling, may be included in the term 'the clergy.' It was thought that this could best be done by treating in sketches typical clergymen who were literary men, and then making a more extended examination of the most important writers—Dwight, Channing, Parker, Bushnell, Beecher and Brooks, who by their work would illustrate the whole subject.

"Sufficient biographical material has been introduced to give a background to the purely literary analysis. No attempt has been made to enter into theological discussion or criticism. Religious references occur only when rendered necessary because of the theological character of the books that are examined" (p. viii).

Already we are a good way from "the Clergy in American life," concerning which phase of his subject Mr. Addison has little more to say

than may be inferred from a typical excerpt: "The awe with which the clergyman was regarded reached a climax in the Sabbath morning, when he proceeded to the meeting house for worship. . . . When the discourse was concluded, sometimes called by admiring friends a 'large, nervous, and golden discourse,' the minister went back to the regular life of the manse, which means that he often worked in his garden, and sawed wood, and mingled with the people on terms of friendly interest. Within the parsonage or manse, or in the South the rectory, there was a wholesome, intellectual life, deepened often by a manly religion" (pp. 3, 4).

Turning then, to the "Clergy in American letters," and opening at the chapter which deals with "Poetry and Romance," we may read such bits of "purely literary analysis" as this: "The clergy have always been fond of the poets, storing up a phrase or a couplet to lend greater beauty and power to the truth which they have set forth. Horace and Milton were read, not only with the interest of the teacher, but because of a message to the imagination, which loosed the play of fancy and created a music within, seeking an outlet in verse. There have been many of the clergy who, in moments of special feeling, or to commemorate important events, to stir up patriotism or to aid in worship, have written lines that bear within them the human emotions of passion, devotion, and reverence" (pp. 84-85).

Again Mr. Addison's discussion of sacred poetry in America may be summarized, in his own words, as follows: "American hymnology has not been thoroughly studied, but enough is known to justify the assertion that this branch of poetry has been largely cultivated among the clergy of all denominations. . . . The genuinely famous hymns, those that have found their way into other lands, are not numerous, but they are the flower of American hymnology. As literature they have a vital quality about them which gives them a much greater influence than many a longer and more ambitious poem. . . . Among the hymns that are used by churches everywhere are 'My faith looks up to Thee,' by Ray Palmer; 'Stand up, stand up for Jesus,' by George Duffield; 'I would not live away,' by William Augustus Muhlenberg; George Washington Doane's 'Softly now the light of day' and 'Fling out the banner'; John Leland's 'The day is past and gone'; 'Lord, lead the way the Saviour went,' of William Croswell; Edmund Hamilton Sears's 'Calm on the listening ear of night'; and 'My Country, 'tis of thee,' and 'The morning light is breaking,' by Samuel Francis Smith" (pp. 96-99).

Finally, one or two of Mr. Addison's comments on the late Bishop of Massachusetts, whom he holds in tender and saint-like reverence, will fairly typify his sketches of individual character: "He was the ideal minister of the American gospel, for he gathered into himself the best elements of American manhood, he had the deepest faith in American institutions, he had the energy, the large vision, the persistent hope of the young nation dealing with its problems of government, education, and character. And he was peculiarly the preacher of a Gospel" (p. 341).

"The life of Phillips Brooks in its varied aspect was that of a stalwart American citizen who won the affection and appreciation of his generation by the earnestness of his life as a tolerant and inspiring leader in all things that make for the best interests of a nation. He was a preacher, but he was also a marked personality, who impressed himself upon the time, and will ever be remembered as a representative American to whom men will gladly refer, when they try to point out the possibilities of American manhood" (p. 384).

Mr. Addison, in fact, has read diligently; he has taken copious notes; and he has not found time to think them into their mutual relations, to phrase them pleasantly, or to infuse into them any suggestions of value. The index, which fills fourteen pages, seems distinctly more careful than the book.

BARRETT WENDELL.

*Essays on the Monetary History of the United States.* By CHARLES J. BULLOCK, PH.D. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1900. Pp. x, 292.)

This little volume, belonging to the "Citizen's Library of Economics, Politics and Sociology," consists of three essays entitled "Three Centuries of Cheap Money in the United States;" "The Paper Currency of North Carolina;" and "The Paper Currency of New Hampshire." A critic might possibly quarrel with its inclusion in a series of volumes of so general an interest as implied by the library title, and at least might fairly challenge the shorter title on the cover, "Monetary History of the United States," as misleading. This, however, is a question for the editor and publishers to settle, for the author is conscientiously careful to indicate that the essays are simply contributions to the monetary and financial history of the United States collected in the preparation of lectures. The essays for the topics covered are thorough and well done. The author's general thesis is that the movements in this country in favor of cheap money, from the earliest period of colonization down to the most recent manifestations, have been chiefly due to the constant spread of settlement westward over large areas that have long remained thinly populated. The inflationist movement finds its strength in the sparsely settled regions where the scarcity of capital is experienced most keenly. In support of this proposition there is the more general essay, the first of those mentioned above, which includes a survey of wampum and barter currency, the silver and gold and paper currencies of the colonies, Continental paper money, the state banks of issue, the treasury notes of the Civil War period, and the more recent agitation for an increase of silver coinage. The author then proceeds to test his thesis by a detailed investigation of the currency experience of two colonies, one in the south, North Carolina, the other in the north, New Hampshire.

The proposition is not a new one, as the author admits; it has been dwelt upon by Professor Sumner; but Professor Bullock, although he

does not overwork the theory, keeps it prominently to the front so that at every stage of the evolution a clear picture is set forth.

The first essay is of special interest. In writing of Continental money, the author clearly shows that Congress was not mainly responsible for the monetary demoralization of the period, for the several states had set the pace and Congress was practically forced to accept the prevailing sentiment of its constituents. It was no time for that assemblage to educate its constituents to more accurate economic thinking. The author accepts the conclusion that Congress was not given the right to issue legal-tender money under the Constitution, and supports his conclusions by the researches of Mr. Libby, which show that the adoption of the Constitution was most keenly opposed in the several states where the very elements which were in favor of paper money issues were strongest. Mr. Bullock has apparently a poor opinion of the work of the state banks of issue before the Civil War, and it may fairly be questioned whether he gives sufficient credit to these institutions, particularly to those established in the East during the period 1840-1860. The author does not include in his general survey any essay on the issues of government paper money for the period 1812-1857. In the treatment of the agitation for silver legislation, Mr. Bullock believes that the Sherman Act was pushed through Congress as a price for tariff support from the West, and in this follows the account given by Senator Teller in his speech of April 29, 1896.

The two essays on the colonial issues of New Hampshire and North Carolina are of less general interest, though of great value to the special investigator. Throughout the work there is a wealth of notes and references, and the mark of the scholar is on every page. The studies are "original" in the truest sense of the term.

While in general agreement with the thesis advocated by the author, I am inclined to believe that a sufficient allowance has not been granted to other influences which led the American people to the adoption of inflation theories. In particular, reference might be made to the abstract political philosophy which has taken possession of large sections of our population at one time and another, which has led to the conclusion that a democratic people is sovereign not only in political activities, but even in attaining economic results. There has been a conviction, and an honest conviction, that value could be created by legislation, a theory which I believe has had close relationship to the theory of the sovereign rights of man. The author, it appears to me, insists too much upon the desire of people to escape their just obligations, and does not take into account sufficiently the superficial philosophy which has been current.

DAVIS RICH DEWEY.

*Stage-Coach and Tavern Days.* By ALICE MORSE EARLE. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1900. Pp. xvi, 449.)

In her adopted field, which has become her own, Mrs. Earle renews the life of our early centuries. Through her sparkling narrative and by

the collateral aids of pencil and camera, the slow-moving life of the colonies is set forth and brought along into the bustling times of the nineteenth century.

In New England, the Puritan "ordinary" became at once an important function in the activities of the rising communities. As indicated (p. 20) every person as well as all material substance was economized and used then. Widows served well in caring for travellers and thus released male citizens for other work, where petticoats would have been a greater hindrance. By the close of the seventeenth century (p. 30) this word "ordinary" was dropped and tavern became the name of the social centres in the colonies. It is assumed generally that inn was the English denomination of this place and social function, as against tavern in trans-Atlantic use. But Shakspere, if we exclude inns in the legal sense, uses the word tavern nearly twice as often as he uses inn.

The book shows clearly—what impresses every reader of our early history—that the tavern was the main spring of our early social life, wherever it ran outside the churches, and the landlord was the protagonist. The modern club, exchange, auction room, board of trade, or journalistic centre—all these had their germs in the tap-room of the Blue Anchor, Green Dragon, or Merchant's Coffee House of olden time. Ships' cargoes, lands, houses, negroes, merchandise of all sorts were negotiated, traded, or vendued in these cheery old taverns. The captain of these industries, the lord of this unsurveyed and unmeasured land was "if not the greatest man in town certainly the best known and ever the most picturesque and cheerful figure" (p. 62). John Dunton hardly exaggerated when he sketched the delightful portrait of George Monk, presiding host at the Blue Anchor, Boston, 1686. John Adams gives a most significant picture of tavern life (p. 172) in 1772. Unknown, he sat by a bar-room fire in Shrewsbury. "There presently came in, one after another, half a dozen, or half a score substantial yeomen of the neighborhood, who sitting down to the fire after lighting their pipes, began a lively conversation on politics." He reports the substance of their talk, which embodied the issues of the coming revolution as well as John or Samuel Adams could do it. Farmers like these, soon "embattled" at Concord and Lexington, spoke their opinions through the old muskets of the French and Indian wars.

The attack on the British cruiser *Gaspee* in Narragansett Bay—the first overt act of the American Revolution—was planned by John Brown and his *confrères* in a Providence tavern on South Main Street. If we would see how they were used in the opposite direction by royal agents and press-gangs, read the accounts (p. 191) of a Norfolk tavern. On the walls of these old tap-rooms were spread couplets conveying many homely truths (p. 45):

"I've trusted many to my sorrow,  
Pay today. I'll trust tomorrow."

In 1824 Lafayette's companions found fifty taverns as good as Bispham's at Trenton, N. J. (p. 83). The accommodation was as good

as at English provincial inns and the food was better. In the same period the City Hotel kept by two old bachelors (p. 37) in New York City was a famous hostelry. It was said that Willard never went to bed, but "performed his parts of host, clerk, book-keeper and cashier." Certainly he attended to his business literally; for when he was called out on the great occasion that opened Niblo's Garden, it was found that he had not owned a hat for years.

Coaching by stage was fairly established about the middle of the eighteenth century. In 1718 (p. 260) Wardwell ran a line from Boston to Rhode Island, now Newport. The first carriages were an extension of a carryall, with seats across, somewhat like the present Concord wagon. The stage-coach proper, developed from the English models, was perfected at Concord, N. H., in 1827. These coaches have gone over the whole world. This method of travel was very romantic and the old driver was hardly inferior to the landlord of the tavern as a social agent.

Our author gives proper emphasis (p. 245) to the evolution of the Conestoga wagon, prairie schooner, army transport, from the days of Braddock's march to its entry into San Francisco. It has embarked at the Golden Gate and probably it will occupy the Philippines, for it is a vehicle of civilization.

The book is the most interesting of Mrs. Earle's writings; but it is not the best arranged. It shows haste and a lack of proportion, the inferior parts crowding and jostling the better portions. There is some confusion in the treatment of different sections of the country, and by confounding periods of time. If pictures are to illustrate and not carry the text, why is there a modern house (p. 23) like Buckman's Tavern, to set forth the Puritan ordinary in its earliest days? The matter being redundant, the text loses by complication of facts drawn from English history. An extended account of life and movement, in tavern and coach, should not be dumped (p. 434) into a graveyard and end abruptly in an epitaph.

But these are minor criticisms. The matter affords important illustrations of history, and the treatment is interesting. The gossiping style accords with the subject in hand, and the author's patient industry sufficiently guarantees the numerous facts. The book is amply illustrated, beautifully printed, and mounted on clumsy paper.

WILLIAM B. WEEDEN.

*The Referendum in America, together with some Chapters on the History of the Initiative, and other Phases of Popular Government in the United States.* By ELLIS PAXSON OBERHOLTZER, Ph.D. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1900. Pp. x, 430.)

So many of the books on public questions at the present day are written to advocate some particular reform, rather than to set forth the observed facts of political evolution; so many of the authors ought to be classed as political pamphleteers, rather than as students of the science

of government; that it is refreshing to take up a work like Mr. Oberholtzer's, which aims, not at urging a panacea, but at describing the progress actually made by a novel institution. Novel it may fairly be called, although the use of the popular vote in legislation is by no means new in America. It may be traced to the first adoption of state constitutions in the eighteenth century, and has undergone, as the author points out, a steady and normal development quite apart from foreign influences; yet the movement has received a great impetus of late years by a conscious imitation of Swiss examples. For this very reason Mr. Oberholtzer's book, while in one sense a new edition of his monograph published in 1893, contains a great deal that has occurred in the interval, and has, in fact, as he tells us, been entirely rewritten.

The first two chapters are devoted to a study of the struggle in the state of Pennsylvania between the French conception of democracy embodied in a single chamber, which was advocated by Franklin, and John Adams's ideas of popular government limited by checks and balances. The story as told is both interesting and in itself valuable, and we should be sorry not to have it, but one must admit that its relation to the rest of the book is not very close.

In the third chapter the author enters upon his real subject, with an account of the extension of the functions of the state constitutional convention at the expense of the legislature. He next proceeds to describe the submission of constitutions for ratification to popular vote, a practice which, after having become to all appearance a universal and settled custom, was discarded by the Southern states, first during the period of secession and reconstruction, and again during the last few years for the purpose mainly of disfranchising the negroes.

Mr. Oberholtzer follows with careful discrimination the operation of the popular vote in the amendment of constitutions, and then traces its use in general legislation of various kinds up to the complete adoption of the Referendum and Initiative in the Swiss form by South Dakota, in 1898. He points out that while the practice of giving the legislature constitutional authority to submit laws to the people of the state has increased, the courts have tended to decide that without such authority the submission cannot be made. On the other hand the courts have tended no less strongly to uphold the right of the legislature without constitutional permission, to make the local application of a law depend upon the vote of the people of the locality. Although the opinions of the judges are not always clear or consistent, the real legal reason for this distinction is simple. The objection to a general Referendum without constitutional sanction is based on the principle that the legislature has no right to delegate to anyone else the powers entrusted to it; but it is always authorized, specifically or by implication, to delegate local government to local bodies, and it is as well justified in making the delegation to the people of a town as to the mayor or council.

The instances of the submission of local matters, or the local application of general laws, to local popular vote, are manifold, and Mr.

Oberholtzer reviews them very fully, devoting more than one-third of the book to different phases of the subject. The matters in regard to which such a vote is taken are of endless variety, but the author makes it appear very clearly that, until the recent imitation of Swiss methods, the Referendum, both general and local, (and for that matter the Initiative as well) was confined to definite questions determined beforehand by law.

In his chapter on the Initiative, Mr. Oberholtzer points out the curious fact that it has been found necessary, especially in the case of efforts to change the county seat, to restrain the use of the Initiative by allowing petitions for the purpose to be presented only at long intervals, by requiring a large number of signers, and by insisting on a guarantee against pecuniary loss to the community.

This remark leads naturally to the only general criticism—if it be a criticism—that we have to make on the book. The work is devoted to a study of the legal provisions for the Referendum, and tells us little of its actual results. The author does indeed point out the smallness of the vote cast, and the common tendency of the people to vote for or against all the questions presented at one time without discriminating much between them. But except for this, there are only scattered references here and there to particular votes, with nothing in the nature of an attempt to collect or tabulate the results. The Referendum and the Initiative in the Swiss form have, indeed, been adopted here too recently to make their use of any consequence as yet, but in the native form, which Mr. Oberholtzer thinks decidedly the best suited to our condition, the Referendum has existed for a long time, and a general collection of statistics concerning its effects might be highly valuable. Perhaps he may at some time in the future complete his subject by doing this work. If so, he may feel assured that we shall be even more grateful to him than we are today.

A. LAWRENCE LOWELL.

*English Common Law in the Early American Colonies.* By PAUL SAMUEL REINSCH, Ph.D., LL.B., Assistant Professor of Political Science in the University of Wisconsin. (University of Wisconsin. 1899. Pp. 64.)

THE ordinary theory of the courts regarding the beginnings of the common law in America is, of course, that the early settlers brought it with them as a birthright (so far as applicable to their conditions) and looked upon it from the first as a positive system wherever not replaced by colonial enactment. Such a statement, Dr. Reinsch rightfully contends, is historically incomplete and inaccurate. The points he urges in modification may be summed up as follows: (1) When the early settlers did refer to their inheritance in the common law, they had in mind only certain general principles of personal liberty, not the highly complex and technical English system; (2) in New England in particular there was a considerable period in which the common law was not consciously re-

garded as binding, and in which indeed it was sometimes consciously rejected; (3) even in the other colonies there existed at first a rude, untechnical, popular law—the child of American conditions, departing widely from the English common law in fact and indifferent to it in theory; (4) it was at a later date, toward the end of the seventeenth century, that the growth of trained lawyers and the pressure from the mother-country brought about the recognition of the English system—which continued, however, to be affected vitally by the earlier American popular law. These positions are justified by an examination into the legal ideas and practice of the early settlers, colony by colony, from north to south.

The criticism is sound; and historians and jurists alike are under obligations to Dr. Reinsch for emphasizing it. It is the more a matter of regret that the monograph is marred by many blemishes. Only a few can be noted here. The author tends to exaggerate his points. There is much repetition within small compass, where greater detail instead would be acceptable. The geographical order of investigation fails to justify itself. There is a curious determination to find "reversions" (on pages 5, 8, 19, 33, 37, 46, and 55, out of fifty-five pages of text): none of these are very clear, and many clearly are not reversions. Thus the union of powers in colonial councils (p. 33) is certainly not an *American* reversion; the courts of justices in Virginia (p. 46) were not a "reversion to the very archaic type of Doomsday of the Anglo-Saxon courts," but a remarkably good copy of an existing English institution; the practice of attainting juries (pp. 19 and 56) was not a "reversion" to an "archaic" custom, but a natural continuance in America of a practice just dying out in England.

Other misstatements abound. The idea that unification of legal principles (p. 9) was in any way due to a growth of national feeling before the Revolution seems an unjustifiable assumption. That magistrates heard cases involving small sums without a jury (p. 13) and that men were fined for "seditious" speech (p. 15) are rather illustrations of the influence of contemporary English practice than the contrary. The Massachusetts *Body of Liberties* (of 1641) could hardly have "re-enacted" (p. 13) a clause of the "fundamentals" (?) of 1646. It is hardly fair to assure us twice that the men of Massachusetts regarded Magna Charta as the "embodiment of the common law" (p. 21) on the authority of a document which has only nine references to Magna Charta and twenty-nine to other "Common Lawes of England." It is impossible to close without regretting the author's frequent dependence upon secondary authorities in a treatise which has for its express purpose to combat vague views accepted on just such a basis. The close following of Campbell's *History* (p. 46) on the Virginian courts is particularly unfortunate—especially in the statement that the "General Court" grew up by custom, seeing that this court was instituted by the earliest charters, and that its appellate jurisdiction (probably the matter in question) was expressly reserved when the county courts were originally established.

W. M. WEST.

*The American Slave-Trade: An Account of its Origin, Growth and Suppression.* By JOHN R. SPEARS. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1900. Pp. xvi, 232.)

FOR the general reader this book may have some interest. To the student of the slave-trade, in its origin, growth, or suppression, it offers nothing of value, in source-material, method, spirit or conclusions.

The work has no bibliography and no index. It possesses five foot-note references, and occasional allusions to sources are scattered through the text. The preface states that the book was written "almost wholly from public documents, biographies, stories of travellers, and other sources of original information." Examination shows that G. Williams's *The Liverpool Privateers*, a work on the English and not the American trade, is drawn upon for statistical and other information, occasionally erroneous; that on the earlier period of the trade the author is indebted for the "documents" cited to Mr. G. C. Mason's article in the *American Historical Record* of July and August, 1872: and that on conditions in Africa, the "middle passage" and the profits of the trade, he apparently makes no distinction between "stories of travellers" on the American and on the English trade.

The author's reiteration of the immorality of the traffic is more pronounced than any search for underlying causes on which it was built. "The assertion that the British forced the traffic on unwilling colonists in America," says Mr. Spears, "is a piling whine," for the latter did not "virtuously" struggle to resist it. Such treatment disposes of early attempts at restrictive legislation in short order, but it also leaves cause and effect largely untouched.

The salient features in the trade—negroes in Africa, captures, middle passage, profits, losses, domestic slave-trade, smuggling, restrictive legislation,—are too frequently touched upon in an illusory manner. For example, under the caption, "The Proportion of Disastrous Voyages," it is said that "something may be told of the proportion of losing to paying voyages." A citation follows from an insurance policy, showing the nature of the risks, and this statement: "For assuming these risks the underwriters charged usually £20 in a hundred, but Mr. William Johnson got at least one policy of a hundred for £18 premium." This is all we learn of the "proportion of losing to paying voyages" in the American slave-trade. Again, we are told that "no trade ever paid such large returns on the investments." In the chapter "The Slavers' Profit" eleven cases are cited, figures given on ten, all showing enormous profits. Six of these cases are taken from Williams's book, mentioned above, and are ships in the English trade. Two more are evidently trading between Cuba and Africa. Our exact information on the profits of vessels in the American slave-trade is thereby cut down to two cases.

The author's unfamiliarity with primary sources leads him into occasional errors. There never was a "Royal Assiento" Company. Consequently the African Company of 1662 could not have sold out to it,

(pp. 15-16). The failure of the Company of Royal Adventurers was due to the Dutch War, not to "interloping," ships. The consequences of interloping are correctly apprehended, but they cannot be assigned to this date, (pp. 15-16). The contracts to furnish 3,000 slaves a year were not with the British West Indies (p. 15), but with certain Spaniards, for the Spanish trade. The "new company" (p. 16) was the Royal African Company. But it was not "chartered" to monopolize the slave-trade under the famous Assiento contract with Spain," (pp. 95, 96), for that contract was not made until forty-one years after the company was chartered. As regards the Assiento, it cannot be true that "only the Royal Company was named in the agreement," (p. 17), for no specific company was named in it at all. When it was awarded it went to the South Sea Company. It could hardly be that under it "all British traders were to participate in the trade," (p. 17), for the South Sea Company contracted with one concern alone for the entire 4,800 slaves annually, to be delivered in specified numbers, at stated times, at certain places on the African coast. Such instances of carelessness do not establish confidence in any of the author's unsupported statements.

The chapter "On the Slave Coast" bears no resemblance to such work as L. Peyraud's corresponding chapter in *L'Esclavage aux Antilles Françaises*. On the growth of the trade there is no tabulation, and no classified or chronological treatment to adequately represent its development, such as Williams appended to his book. As to the volume of the traffic there is no accurate statement. As to the distribution of the slaves in America nothing is said. We find no sufficient analysis of the causes of mortality in the middle passage, no computation of its amount. These might properly find a place in a "history of the American slave-trade." On its suppression one wonders that the author wrote at all, having before him the excellent work of one whom he calls "the distinguished historian of the negro race."

EDWARD D. COLLINS.

*A Century of American Diplomacy.* By JOHN W. FOSTER. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co. 1901. Pp. xiii, 497.)

THIS work is the outgrowth of a series of lectures delivered by the author in the School of Diplomacy of the Columbian University. It is a review of the foreign relations of the United States from 1776 to 1876. The book is divided into twelve chapters and the treatment is chronological with the exception of the last chapter which deals with the Monroe Doctrine.

In the field of diplomatic history the limitations of the chronological method are at once apparent, but Mr. Foster has performed the task which he undertook with a high degree of success. He has produced a very readable book and one which will give many Americans a higher opinion than they at present entertain of the achievements of our diplo-

matic service. The narrative is enlivened by incident, anecdote, and character sketch, but it may be questioned whether the author has not sinned in this respect. Surely such subjects as Jefferson's relations with Freneau, Clay's duel with John Randolph, and President Jackson's efforts to make good the social standing of Mrs. Eaton, might have been dismissed with a word, if indeed the author deemed it necessary to introduce them at all. It may be further questioned whether it is wise to recall at such length the bickerings and mutual suspicions that marred the relations of Franklin, Adams, and Jay during their residence at Paris while negotiating the treaty of 1783.

The judicious temper which the author maintains in his judgments of foreign nations is unfortunately abandoned in some of his estimates of his own countrymen. His antipathy to Jefferson is especially noticeable. The chapter on Jefferson's administration is devoted largely to the Louisiana purchase and to difficulties with the diplomatic corps arising out of the extreme simplicity of the official and social customs introduced by him, but in the chapter on the administrations of Washington and Adams there is a truly remarkable array of quotations reflecting upon Jefferson which apparently have nothing else to commend them to our attention.

The administration of the State Department by Mr. Marcy, who receives scant justice at the hands of some historians, is placed in its true light. The author points out what has been frequently overlooked, that the "Ostend Manifesto," which was the work of Mr. Soulé, was repudiated by Marcy, and as a result Soulé's resignation was offered and accepted. The chapter on the diplomacy of the Civil War, when our relations with England were in so delicate a position, is probably the most interesting as well as the best written.

Of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty Mr. Foster says: "The treaty marks the most serious mistake in our diplomatic history, and is the single instance, since its announcement in 1823, of a tacit disavowal or disregard of the Monroe Doctrine, by the admission of Great Britain to an equal participation in the protection and control of a great American enterprise." In this connection the author takes great liberties with the views of Dr. Francis Wharton. On page 458 he quotes from the *Digest* a passage too long to reproduce here, which, detached from its surroundings, seems to substantiate the opinion just cited. As a matter of fact Wharton held just the opposite view, and in immediate connection with the passage quoted by Mr. Foster refers to the section where that view may be found. On page 243 of Vol. II. Wharton has this to say of the neutralization of the canal as provided for in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty: "Such an international agreement, entered into by all the great powers, would not be in conflict with the Monroe doctrine in the sense above given. For an agreement that no powers whatever should be permitted to invade the neutrality of an Isthmus route, but that it should be absolutely neutralized so as to protect it from all foreign assailants by whom its freedom should be imperiled, is an application, not a contravention,

of the Monroe Doctrine. Such an agreement is not an approval of, but an exclusion of, foreign interposition."

The author endorses President Cleveland's interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine in strong terms, and expresses the opinion that "since the action of Congress on President Cleveland's Venezuelan message, it can no longer be contended that Congress has not formally given its approval to the doctrine, and that too, as the opponents of its latest application admit, in its most extreme form. It stands to-day as a cardinal policy of our government."

The book seems to have been written from primary sources and the quotations have been made with great care and accuracy. It is remarkably free from typographical errors and in form and appearance is admirable.

JOHN HOLLADAY LATANÉ.

*Paul Jones, Founder of the American Navy. A History.* By AUGUSTUS C. BUELL. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1900. Two volumes, pp. 328, 373.)

THE life of Paul Jones has been written many times. Incidents in his career have formed the subjects for several thrilling romances, and he is made the hero in many such works of fiction. Some of these later works on his life have evidently been prepared with paste brush and scissors, while others have without doubt been compiled from the more important English publications on the subject.

The present work under review shows most careful and painstaking research. Mr. Buell has drawn largely from original material, most of which has not previously been used by other writers. He has not only consulted the various printed collections but has had access to the archives of the United States, of France, and of Russia where much relating to this naval hero is deposited and where few have the courage or desire to resort; and the result, for completeness of research, leaves little to be done by future writers on the life of Paul Jones.

There have been few men who have had such a remarkable career or who have touched life at more points than Paul Jones. "Sailor at twelve, mate at seventeen, captain at twenty in the merchant service of the North Atlantic; slave-trader, East Indiaman, and Virginia planter—all before he had passed the age of twenty-six, naval-lieutenant at twenty-eight, captain at twenty-nine, and commodore at thirty-two; at thirty-three the ocean hero of the old world and the new, a knight of France, the most famous sea victor of his time, patronized by kings, petted by duchesses of the blood royal, thanked by Congress, and more than all else, the trusted friend and valued associate of Washington, Franklin, Jefferson, Lafayette, Hamilton and Morris; at thirty-six, selected as special envoy to the most aristocratic of courts, charged with the most delicate, difficult and intricate of missions—adjudicator and collector of international claims, without any guide of precedent or any commonly

recognized code of procedure ; at forty, voted a gold medal by Congress, at forty-one, a vice-admiral in the navy of an empire ; at forty-three a prominent figure in the overture of that tremendous drama, the French Revolution—and dead at forty-five."

In acting as the biographer of a man whose career runs such a gamut Mr. Buell has not been able to conceal or hold in check his admiration for this distinguished naval officer and he speaks for Jones as though he had the knowledge of all the reasons and impulses that governed or influenced him in most of his acts and on many of which Jones himself is silent. This is a most natural consequence in biographical writing, but the determination with which they are expressed warrants a clearer statement of the facts on which they are founded.

The title to the work, *Paul Jones, Founder of the American Navy*, is open to criticism. In what sense was Paul Jones the founder of the American navy? To be sure at the request of his most intimate friend, Joseph Hewes of the Continental Congress, a member of the Naval Committee of June 14, 1775, he was invited to express his views on the kind of ships necessary for the first squadron to be placed in commission by the United Colonies, and later at the request of this committee, and largely through the influence of Mr. Hewes, he labored diligently, examining vessels, supervising alterations and determining armament, and his labors no doubt were of the greatest aid in getting this hurriedly equipped squadron to sea. He never held any active official position in relation to the navy until the middle of December, 1775, when he was commissioned a first lieutenant, the sixth on the list of commissioned officers. If he had been regarded at the time as the one to whom, more than any one else, was due the credit of organizing this squadron, would he not in consequence thereof have been entrusted with its command or would he not have been honored with a higher rank? At any rate if to Jones is to be given the title of "Founder of the American Navy" it must rest upon a more substantial foundation than the title-page to a book, and the absence of foot-notes in the first six chapters leaves the reader in the dark regarding the authorities on which the author relies to substantiate this claim.

Mr. Buell handles with rare delicacy and tenderness that portion of his private life which is open to criticism and his conclusions seem warranted by the little that is known of the actual relation between him and Aimée de Telison. Much would have been added to the value of his work if the author could have pursued his researches to the extent of locating the burial place of this naval hero. The two volumes are written in a style that commands interest and which is sustained until the end.

EDWARD FIELD.

*American History told by Contemporaries*. Edited by ALBERT BUSHNELL HART, Professor of History in Harvard University. Vol. III. National Expansion, 1783-1845. (New York : The Macmillan Co. 1901. Pp. xx, 668.)

ONE of Dr. Hart's pieces is Sydney Smith's well-known diatribe in the *Edinburgh Review*, in which he asks the famous question as to who

reads an American book. His contempt for what had been written in America was natural from his point of view, and not without justification. Little of what is printed in this book is of high literary merit. Yet one cannot examine it carefully without being impressed by the thought how much that was instructive and entertaining the Americans wrote in the first sixty years after the acknowledgment of their independence. However it might appear in London, an observer from Mars, admitting that the inhabitants of this quarter of the globe had little of the refinements of literary cultivation indeed (if the Martian standards are like those of the best of this planet), would nevertheless have said that they had good stuff in them and were bound to accomplish great things.

Dr. Hart has ranged, with evident gusto, over this large mass of writings, and has made an excellent selection of characteristic and entertaining pieces, choosing on much the same principles as governed the composition of his previous volumes. Collections of official documents, writings of public men, diaries and private correspondence, memoir-writers, essayists, travellers and writers of verse, have been drawn upon in rich variety. The compiler's chief object has been to exhibit the complexion of past times, the political and social conditions of American life, rather than to set forth particular events, however striking. Narratives of the events of political history are accordingly not numerous. There are hardly more than a dozen. The chief of them are Nathan Dane's account of the drafting of the Ordinances for the Northwest Territory, M. Otto's account of the Annapolis Convention, a letter of General Lincoln respecting Shays's Rebellion, Madison's description of the closing scenes in the Philadelphia Convention, "Laco's" bitter statement of the manner in which Hancock supported the Constitution in the Massachusetts Convention, selections from the narrative portion of the X. Y. Z. Correspondence, and Lucien Bonaparte's vivid and malicious account of the scene between Napoleon, Joseph and himself over the cession of Louisiana. The much more numerous pieces illustrating social and political questions are similarly well-chosen; but it is difficult to describe them by anything much shorter than a table of contents. We think there might well have been more than one selection from Tocqueville. A more serious criticism might be based upon the lack of pieces illustrating the character and condition of the Southwest. The author is abundantly alive to the importance of the West in his scheme, but it is practically the Northwest alone which is in his mind's eye. Now south of the Ohio and west of Georgia there dwell to-day nearly as many millions as north of the Ohio and west of Pennsylvania. They have been the Boeotians of our history. We have not heard much about them. Yet their development is well worth recounting, for they constitute one of our great types and embrace something near a quarter of our population.

We dwell upon this thought because it is distinctly the habit of historical scholars, more especially of Northern historical scholars, not to consider the western expansion of this portion of our population in any-

thing like the same way as that in which they view the western expansion of the North. This may be clearly seen in Dr. Hart's treatment of the annexation of Texas. It is made a sub-section under "Slavery and Abolition." It was natural that a former generation should see the episode in this guise; but must we not now see that the relation of the annexation of Texas to the extinction of slavery is only one-half of the Texan story? No one can read the narratives of the earlier Texans, such for instance as are constantly appearing in the *Quarterly* of the Texas State Historical Association, without perceiving that, in the main, the Republic of Texas stands on the same basis as the short-lived republics of West Florida, California and Hawaii, and that the movement toward the occupation of that country is, independently of slavery, a wholly natural and very interesting part of the great epic of American expansion. A few pieces exhibiting Southwestern development would help to make all this clear to the youthful mind.

It is probably right, though it is certainly disagreeable, to mention some small defects in the practical introduction which is prefixed to this excellent book. P. 2, Bancroft's *Constitution* "reprinted with documents as a sixth volume," etc., should of course be "reprinted without the documents." It is a great pity that in the bibliography and in the text the edition of Jefferson's writings cited should be the old one by Professor Washington and not the new one by Mr. Paul Ford. One cannot complain so much that W. C. Ford's *Washington* is ignored in favor of Sparks's. It is not enormously better. But the earlier edition of Jefferson was distinctly bad; and the student surely ought rather to be referred to Mr. Ford's admirable collection. One does not know what to make of the characterization of Maclay's *Journal* as "the most valuable periodical journal of the period" (p. 10). Indeed, we must think it a mistake to give so much prominence to Maclay in so brief a bibliography (pp. 10, 12), and to give two long pieces from him in the text, without declaring emphatically the reserves with which his opinions must be taken. Maclay was a contemptible creature if there ever was one, and if we are forced, because the other senators did not keep diaries, or their descendants have failed to produce them, to see things through his jaundiced eyes, the young among us are entitled to a warning, to account for the strange colors they see.

*A History of Political Parties in the United States.* By J. P. GORDY, Ph.D. In four volumes. Vol. I. (New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1900. Pp. 598.)

*Political Parties in the United States, 1846-1861.* By JESSE MACY, A.M., LL.D. [The Citizen's Library.] (New York: The Macmillan Co. Pp. viii, 333.)

*A History of Political Parties in the United States.* By JAMES H. HOPKINS, formerly Representative in Congress from Pennsylvania. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1900. Pp. 477.)

HERE are three books with practically the same title and dealing with the same general subject. They are, however, quite unlike, because the writers have set themselves different aims, have adopted different methods of treatment, and have had widely different standards of workmanship. Two of the writers are professors in western colleges; the third is a retired congressman.

I had hoped to find in Mr. Hopkins's book, written as it is by a man who has had the advantage of contact with large affairs, the human touch too often wanting in books about American politics written under academic influences. But his treatise can scarcely be considered a serious contribution to political history. The text is little more than a running account of national elections from the beginning down to the present time, interspersed with brief and unedifying references to well-known events which are supposed to have affected parties and candidates. There is no evidence of research, no illuminating discussion, no skill in arrangement, no charm of narrative. His comments on public men are very much in the style of congressional eulogies. Jefferson, whose departure from Washington in 1809 was anything but triumphal, retired, according to Mr. Hopkins, "crowned with honors and happy in the prosperity of his country." Andrew Jackson's achievement at New Orleans is magnified by doubling the strength of Pakenham's army. It is asserted without qualification that the financial disturbance following Jackson's removal of the deposits was "an artificial panic, started by the brokers and agents of the banks and hostile politicians." Throughout, party platforms and similar utterances are accepted at their face value; there is no attempt whatever to go behind them to determine what parties have actually stood for. An appendix—nearly half the book—gives in full all the platforms adopted by national conventions.

Of Professor Gordy and Professor Macy it may be said that both have taken their subject seriously, both have written candidly and without apparent inclination to arraign or to defend any party organization. Professor Gordy's book is the second edition, somewhat revised, of the first of four volumes in which he proposes to cover the whole field of our political history. It brings the narrative down to the end of Jackson's administration. Treating with much care and in considerable detail the formation of the Constitution, the great constructive measures of the early congresses, and the foreign and international difficulties of the new government, the work is really more than a history of parties. A more accurate title would be "*A History of Government in the United States, with Special References to Party Controversies.*" Professor Macy's narrative is confined to the period from 1846 to 1861; but he gives more space to general discussion, to the philosophy of the subject, than Professor Gordy. Perhaps the latter will in a future volume give us more at length the general views which in his close study of specific controversies he has not, as yet, found occasion fully to set forth.

In truth, however, it is no light undertaking to interpret in any broad way the history of American politics. One finds it easier and safer to

record what actually happened, to cite written documents, to characterize leaders. The American people have expressed through party organizations far more than party organizations are meant to express. No phase of the national character but must be realized, no considerable interest but must be considered, no class or section that can be neglected, by the man who tries to comprehend our party system. Professor Gordy's plan is merely to ask of each party what it aims to do, and the answer to that question is perhaps all that a historian not endowed with genius can hope to achieve.

He finds that the Federalist party was trying "to give the country a government with power enough to do the things essential to the well-being of the nation," and that it succeeded. He does not say simply "to create a nation," because he holds that we were one nation and not thirteen, under the Articles of Confederation, notwithstanding that the Articles were no true constitution of government and notwithstanding the popular impression to the contrary which prevailed at the time. Into that old controversy it is scarcely worth while to enter here, but Professor Gordy himself supplies ample material for argument on the other side. Indeed, even one who inclines to the contrary view may well question whether the notion that a man's state was his nation ever was so widespread as Professor Gordy thinks it was.

Few writers have ever held the balance so firmly true while weighing Hamilton against Jefferson. Professor Gordy has not the imagination and literary skill to present these two fascinating characters in a way to make us see them as their contemporaries saw them. But he credits each of them with great abilities, he finds for each a place which no other could have filled. That Hamilton was not in sympathy with those ideas and aspirations which have worked themselves out in American history, and which are now generally recognized as the characteristic and essential things in American life, he makes plainer than ever. He even intimates that Hamilton changed his position on the question of our relations with France when Adams had been persuaded to make him second in command to Washington, and that he was influenced by his ambition for a military career. But the wisdom of the specific measures which Hamilton originated is fully conceded.

As to Jefferson and his philosophy, Jefferson the Republican is clearly and justly distinguished from Jefferson the Democrat. The distinction is an important one. If only his extreme states-rights views, his violent opposition to centralization, be taken into account, it is hard to see that the teaching of Jefferson has to-day any force with his countrymen. The national government has so grown in power, its revenues and activities have been so multiplied, and the sovereignty of the individual states has become so meaningless a phrase, that his views in that regard may be considered as antiquated as Hamilton's monarchical proclivities. Jefferson the interpreter of the Constitution is discredited by subsequent history quite as effectively as Hamilton the distruster of the people. It is Jefferson the champion of the individual who still,

after more than a century of progress towards his ideals, beckons us on to bolder and bolder experiment of ourselves. His is at once the most peccable and the most unassailable career in our history. Half of his philosophy is already abandoned by his own disciples. The other half is professed even by those who would call themselves disciples of his adversary.

The candor, fairness, and good judgment of Professor Gordy are well displayed in the two important chapters which treat of the Alien and Sedition Laws and the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions. He is at pains to make clear not merely what the Federal statutes and the Republican protests actually meant, but how the two parties looked at the matter and what each party thought of the other. The Laws are condemned and so are the Resolutions. One party had been led on to tyranny, the other goaded into something which, if it was not itself rebellion, was to breed insurrection in after years. Yet the position of both parties seems natural in view of their mutual misunderstanding and distrust.

On the whole, this first volume indicates that the writer is well-equipped for the task he has undertaken, provided he adheres to the method he has adopted. Careful and thoughtful students will find his book useful for reference, sane, intelligent, reasonable. It will never be popular, for there is not a brilliant line in it. The style is by no means bad, but it is undeniably dry. That, however, we have come to expect. It seems to be the rule rather than the exception that writers on history and politics shall forego such opportunities for fine writing as they find in their way.

Professor Macy's book probably has less permanent value than Professor Gordy's. Contributing little or nothing to our knowledge of the controversies through which the country struggled from war with Mexico to civil war, it must stand or fall on the views which are advanced with unusual freedom concerning the ways in which secession might have been prevented. Professor Macy is fond of "ifs." The boldest "if" of all is expressed in this sentence: "Had President Taylor lived it is probable that the compromise measure of 1850 would have been defeated, California would probably have been admitted as a free state, Texas would have been confined within narrower limits, the Union would not have been divided, and the Whig party would have drawn to itself the support of all classes who were in favor of restricting slavery within its existing limits." This is followed by an interesting attack on that view of history which enables a historian to content himself with merely explaining what actually took place. It is an error, Professor Macy thinks, to accept what has happened as inevitable—quite as bad an error as to make the whole course of history turn upon accidents. "To teach that the disruption of this Union and the horrible tragedy of our civil war are events that could not have been prevented is," he declares, "as immoral as it is to teach that every normal young man must inevitably lead for a time an immoral life."

It is no doubt true that many of us, having traced events to their causes, rest content with that achievement alone. Things done have too much the effect of finality. One concedes Professor Macy's general contention, but he is not convincing when he tries to point out just how the Whigs could have kept their party alive, drawn to their support both the anti-slavery men of the North and the conservative men of the South, and so saved the Union without war. It was the blunders and sins of men, and no mere harsh decree of fate, that cost us so many precious lives. But it was not the blunders and sins of the Whig party alone. We were expiating the follies and crimes of centuries, not those of a decade merely. These had brought about such a state of things, such a binding together of dissimilar civilizations, such antagonisms between sections, such bitterness of feeling, that one looking back no farther than the year 1850 can say with reason that division and war were then clearly inevitable, whether President Taylor lived or died, whether Clay's compromise measures passed or not. In the great Greek tragedies, Fate controls; but Fate, being interpreted, means ancient sin.

Professor Macy's later chapters are notable for the consideration he gives to Stephen A. Douglas. It is too common, now that Lincoln's fame is grown to its full proportions, to dwarf his contemporaries that his stature may seem the greater. A reaction is sure to come. It will not, of course, deprive Lincoln of the first place in the history of his times, but Douglas will certainly have his revenge for the unwise belittling of his career which has been the fashion. To exclude him from the well known "American Statesmen" series, while places were found for Charles Francis Adams and Thaddeus Stevens, was altogether unjust. From the death of Clay until Lincoln was nominated, Douglas's was quite the most important figure on the stage; and the man who thus dominated a notable epoch was not altogether unworthy of the place he then held in the public eye.

I should add that Mr. Hopkins escapes an error into which both Professor Macy and Professor Gordy have fallen. He spells Breckinridge correctly.

WILLIAM GARROTT BROWN.

*The Writings of James Monroe.* Edited by STANISLAUS MURRAY HAMILTON. Vol. IV., 1803-1806. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1900. Pp. xviii, 509.)

THE conclusion of Mr. Hamilton's fourth volume brings him to the end of the year 1806. Now of the letters of Monroe preserved in the Department of State, which are the chief staple of Mr. Hamilton's collection, somewhat less than four-ninths precede that date and somewhat more than five-ninths are subsequent to it. There is here some ground for apprehension. If continued upon the same scale the collection will amount to nine or ten volumes. We believe that only six were originally promised. Nine or ten such volumes represent a mass of material,

and to the buyer an amount of expense, which to many persons will seem excessive ; in proportion to fourteen volumes of Washington, ten volumes of Adams and of Jefferson, nine or ten of Monroe is a large quantity. We should be sorry if a general feeling that this is the case should cause Mr. Hamilton to abridge too much the latter portions of his collection ; for it is here that its main interest and importance will surely be found. For the period of our political history extending to 1815 we do not lack material in the shape of official and private correspondence. After 1815 we have comparatively much less, and Mr. Hamilton's chief opportunity to make a notable contribution of new material for American history lies in the eight years of Monroe's presidency. Abridgment would have been more in place in these earlier years. The present volume contains not a few letters of quite trivial importance.

At the same time the book contains much that is useful and interesting, though Monroe's style does not cease to be dull. Here are 112 letters, of which few have ever been printed before. About three-fourths of them come from the collections of Monroe, Madison and Jefferson papers in the Department of State ; others from a letter-book possessed by the Library of Congress, from the *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, from the private collection of Mrs. James Lyons, etc. The last mentioned are of exceptional interest, being letters of Monroe to John Randolph. The manner in which Monroe meets Randolph's flattering letters, suggesting that he rather than Madison shall be the Republican candidate for the presidency, is admirable. He says (p. 407) :

" My own opinion is then, that the idea had better be relinquished :— that by such relinquishment the cause of free government would be more essentially served than by pursuing it. There are older men, whom I have long been accustomed to consider as having higher pretensions to the trust than myself, whose claims it would be painful to me to see rejected ; and you will find that I repose an unbounded confidence in your honour and candour when I state to you that the person who seems to be contemplated by others is in that class. It would be impossible to embark in such a controversy without putting in opposition, through the whole community, men who have been long in the habit of dangerous and laborious co-operation in support of that cause ;—without harrowing up their feelings and tearing up by the roots ancient friendships."

This is in June, 1806. How well Monroe's magnanimity and fortitude would stand the severer test imposed by Jefferson's rejection of his treaty, remains to be shown in the next volume. Much in the present volume shows that he had gained in magnanimity and in balance as well as in diplomatic experience. He is still prone to suspicion and to undue anxiety respecting his personal position ; but he understands Europe and his task better. This is partly due to the fact that he is carrying on the task—not very successfully, it must be admitted—in London, where there was no barrier of language in the way of his somewhat slow thought.

Beside letters, Mr. Hamilton prints, widely separated, two fragments of a journal or memorandum respecting the Louisiana negotia-

tions of April, 1803, a formal opinion respecting the question of West Florida, and a note respecting our differences with Spain which Monroe prepared for publication in the *Morning Chronicle* in May, 1806, but which he concluded to suppress.

Students of the history of deaf-mute instruction will find interesting matter in certain letters to John Randolph (pp. 414, 480, 485) who had confided to Monroe's care a deaf-mute nephew.—Many passages which, under the most restricted scheme of annotation, might well have footnotes, are left unexplained.

*Numbers and Losses in the Civil War in America, 1861-65.* By THOMAS L. LIVERMORE, Member of the Military Historical Society of Massachusetts. (Boston : Houghton, Mifflin and Company. 1900. Pp. vi, 150.)

COLONEL LIVERMORE, the author, served in the Civil War as major and brevet colonel of the Fifth, and as colonel of the Eighteenth New Hampshire Volunteers, and is well qualified to interpret military records and reports; as a member of the Massachusetts Military Historical Society, he has heretofore devoted attention to the subjects of this volume. After a thorough examination during the last three years, of about all accessible records relating to them, he has embodied his conclusions in this book.

Colonel Livermore aims to establish, upon the best evidence obtainable, the number of men who served during the Civil War in the Confederate army. In this he is unquestionably successful, and the result of the evidence and estimates he produces is incontrovertible.

In the pursuit of evidence, on which to base just conclusions, the author touches on the courage and efficiency of the Union and of the Confederate army; gives the numbers engaged in a list of battles, in each of which the losses were not less than 1,000; compares battles with others corresponding to them; and submits a table of the successes and defeats on both sides of the war, as well as estimates of the losses of the Confederate army.

An official statement of the number of men who served in the Confederate army is not on record. Some Confederate writers have estimated this number to be from 600,000 to 700,000. Only one of these writers attempts to show by figures the correctness of his estimate, and Colonel Livermore by using these figures demonstrates that the highest of Confederate estimates is too low.

A detailed description of Colonel Livermore's methods is impracticable in this place and only some of the main results at which he arrives can be referred to here.

Based on the census of 1860 and the conscription laws of the Confederacy the number of men in its military service is found to have been 1,239,000. Based on the average total strength of regiments, etc., in the Confederate service, including irregular organizations, two figures,

namely—1,227,890 and 1,406,180, are obtained as the number of enrollments made; the last number Colonel Livermore considers probably too high, and believes that the mean between the two, namely—1,317,035, will come nearer to the actual number of enrollments made.

By converting the terms of service for which men were enrolled, into terms actually served by them, deeming the war to have closed May 4, 1865, without regarding deaths, desertions, etc., and reducing the total of these terms to a standard term of three years, the number of enrollments made in the Union and Confederate armies is found to be equal, respectively, to 1,536,678 and 1,082,119 men who actually served three years.

The number of Confederates who were killed or died of wounds received in action is estimated at 94,000, and those who died of disease at at least 164,000, making a total loss by death of at least 258,000.

Colonel Livermore presents his subject in clear and simple language, and in a soldierly and most impartial manner, and is to be congratulated on his success. His work is of intrinsic value, and will no doubt be accepted by every intelligent survivor of the Civil War, whether Confederate or Union; there is nothing but honor in its pages for all. The collector of war literature and statistics should and will prize the book highly and the layman will find it interesting and instructive reading.

*The Mississippi Valley in the Civil War.* By JOHN FISKE. (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Co. Pp. xxvi, 368.)

It goes without saying that *The Mississippi Valley in the Civil War*, by John Fiske, is an unusually interesting and readable book. Mr. Fiske could not write a dull book on any subject, and the matters with which he deals in this one, and in his very best manner, might command attentive perusal although treated by the prosiest writers. The book has some minor faults, or what seem to be such in the judgment of those who do not sympathize with the author in the sentiment with which he regards the causes and conduct of the great struggle. Such readers cannot help thinking him at times essentially, although perhaps unconsciously, partizan. Of partizanship in any offensive sense, or to a degree which is positively misleading, no one who is not himself unduly influenced by prejudice will accuse him; and it is evident that he has striven to be fair in his estimate not only of the events, but of the actors he writes of. Nevertheless he occasionally uses language which, while not appreciably impairing the value of his work as a military treatise, or its historical accuracy, yet does a certain injustice, produces a wrong impression, and reflects on some of the Confederate officers mentioned, in a way that is neither warranted nor generous. It is certainly not fair to style a Confederate cavalry leader a "guerilla," merely because he has performed a special kind of service with more than ordinary enterprise and efficiency. During the war period that term was applied, both in the North and the South, to men who were not soldiers at all, but

bandits and marauders, and a great many people still so understand it. Nor is it at all accurate to liken the operations of the raiding cavalry of the Confederacy to the guerilla warfare at one time conducted in certain countries of Europe. The resemblance, if there be any, is too slight to be considered ; and that the term is used as one of reproach is best shown by the fact that Mr. Fiske never employs it in describing similar service performed by the Federal cavalry.

He is guilty of a similar "unjust discrimination," when he characterizes Albert Pike as "an adventurer from Massachusetts." Pike migrated to Arkansas when barely twenty-one years old, and had lived in the South for thirty years when the Civil War began. He was eminent at the bar and in many ways, was a man of high character and social position, and was perfectly convinced of the justice of the cause for which he fought. It may be that the appellation of "rebel" is properly bestowed on all who served the Confederacy, whether born in the North or the South, but there is no more reason to style Albert Pike "an adventurer from Massachusetts," than to term General George H. Thomas an adventurer from Virginia.

So seldom, however, does Mr. Fiske err in this regard and so venial are his lapses from a really impartial account of the events he relates, that we might not observe them if the general tone of his narration were not so free from acrimony and any trace of illiberal temper that the slightest suggestion of such feeling, upon his part, jars us more than bucketsful of abuse from some other war-historians.

While one who has himself seen service in the field may detect in this book evidences of the lack of such experience in its author, it is quite as true that no mere soldier could have written it nearly so well. This is not simply because of the vivid, graphic, picturesque style in which the story is told, and the absence of that dry, technical and unnecessary detail which makes so much of purely military narrative tedious and difficult of appreciative attention, but because of the very lucid and comprehensive method in which the subject matter is presented.

A very large subject, embracing a number of parts having a close but not apparent connection, is treated with a logical arrangement and power of explicit statement which only an unusually acute and incisive writer, accustomed to consider and discuss a great variety of topics, could command. Mr. Fiske's previous studies and work in other departments of literature, were unquestionably of value to him when he undertook the task of military criticism.

The book is a story, as its title imports, of military operations during the Civil War in the states of Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee, Arkansas, Mississippi and Louisiana, conducted in a field stretching from the Ohio and Missouri rivers to the Gulf, and from the Mississippi river to the western prairies, in the one direction, and to the mountains of east Tennessee in the other. It describes the embryonic organization on both sides, and the partially purposeless, totally futile effort put forth by each in the beginning of the conflict. It recites the earlier struggles of raw,

undisciplined troops and untrained commanders, occurring contemporaneously but without any concert or understanding, throughout the vast region wherein, according to the mathesis of war, there should have been intelligent co-operation and linked, sustained endeavor; and it shows how, when finally such intelligent direction and energy was furnished, the overwhelming power of the North broke down the desperate resistance, but feebler resources of the South. Commencing with the abortive attempts of those in sympathy with the South to take Kentucky and Missouri into the Confederacy, and the petty skirmishes which marked incipient hostilities, it concludes with the tremendous battles and vast campaigns which shattered the Confederate strength and prestige in the West.

Mr. Fiske has given an exceedingly clear and comprehensive account of how the superior numbers and material, at all times possessed but not always properly applied by the Federal commanders, were ultimately utilized and rendered effective. The justice of his criticism of some of the commanders, on both sides, and his estimate of the relative importance of some of the minor actions and movements he narrates may, perhaps, be disputed; and his statements regarding the comparative numerical strength of the contending armies in the greater battles—that perennial subject of controversy—will, of course, be challenged. But, in the main, his account is not only explicit and coherent but convincing. There are few who will not agree with him that Halleck's retention in chief command of the Union armies paralyzed their efficiency in the West, and that success became possible only when Grant and his able subordinates were given a free hand.

No writer has so well shown how conducive, indispensable indeed, to Federal success was the service performed by the Federal fleets on the inland waters. But for the aid so rendered in the matter of transportation, and the part taken by the gun-boats in many offensive operations wherein the military and naval efforts were combined, the Union arms would never have completely triumphed in the valley of the Mississippi. Efficient naval co-operation assured the reduction of the forts which guarded the Tennessee and the Cumberland, whose capture forced Albert Sidney Johnston's premature abandonment of the line of the Cumberland and the fertile region of middle Tennessee. It compelled also the evacuation of all the formidable defenses of the upper Mississippi. To Farragut's daring passage of Forts Jackson and St. Philip was solely due the early fall of New Orleans; and the use of the lower Mississippi and the Red river opened the trans-Mississippi to Federal occupation. The army of Rosecrans, cooped up in Chattanooga after the battle of Chickamauga, and the reinforcements brought by Grant to its assistance, would have been compelled to disastrous retreat if supplies had not been furnished by water craft plying the Tennessee river; and the subsequent march to Atlanta and from Atlanta to the sea might have been indefinitely postponed, or have never been made. Undoubtedly the two most interesting chapters of the book are those entitled "The Vicksburg Problem" and "The

Fall of Vicksburg," in which the author describes how Grant sought to wrest from the Confederates control of the two hundred and fifty miles of the Mississippi between Vicksburg and Port Hudson, whereby they maintained communication with their territory west of the great river.

Any narrative of these operations must furnish a remarkable testimonial to the skill, resource and extraordinary tenacity of the great captain, and to the patience and endurance of the troops he commanded; but the story has never before been told so graphically and with such power as Mr. Fiske tells it, and its interest is greatly enhanced by the description of the part taken by the fleet.

The conditions, especially topographical, under which the war in the West was conducted, permitted and demanded strategic operations on a grand scale to a greater extent than was possible or necessary in the region wherein the armies of the Potomac and Northern Virginia confronted each other. The much smaller area in which these armies operated, and the less number of objective points whose seizure promised strategic advantages, limited their capacity in this regard, and required instead skillful, tactical maneuvering which might enable battle to be delivered at advantage. But in the valley of the Mississippi, penetrated in all directions by navigable streams connecting with each other, traversed centrally by railroad lines affording both means for offensive operations and ready communication over great distances, and full of objective points inviting attack and demanding defense because their capture or loss involved far-reaching consequences—in this vast field, opportunity was offered for the exercise of strategic ability of the highest order. Mr. Fiske has exhibited, in brief compass, but very clearly, this feature of the conflict.

BASIL W. DUKE.

*Military Reminiscences of the Civil War.* By General JACOB D. COX. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1900. Two vols., pp. xvii, 549; xvi, 596.)

Few if any volumes pertaining to the Civil War equal these in interest. They cover not only the military features of campaigns, but interwoven with these are incidents and the personal and political features attending the movements. The whole flows smoothly on in the scholarly and agreeable style of which General Cox was a master. He had wide experience in the war, having been prominent in the three months' service in West Virginia, in Pope's campaign, in the Antietam, Knoxville, Atlanta, and Nashville campaigns, and, at last, before Wilmington, and in the final operations against Johnston in North Carolina. His was, therefore, a wide field of observation, and his relations to the leading commanders were such as to give him exceptional advantages.

The chapter on the outbreak of the war vividly recalls the rush and the unanimity with which the North, without regard to party, accepted the challenge at Sumter. The details of mobilization at Camp Denni-

son are worthy of study by those writers of our war with Spain who, ignorant of the difficulties of such assembling, drove the nation crazy while our armies were gathering, by attributing conditions which, at the outset, are inseparable from all war camps, to inefficiency and neglect.

The narrative of McClellan's West Virginia campaign is the most satisfactory yet given to the public. It brings into its proper proportions the operations which removed the fighting lines from the northern states, and gave West Virginia to the Union. He justly but temperately criticizes McClellan for leaving Rosecrans to win the battle of Rich Mountain unaided, and claims that on this early theatre of action the same characteristics were noticeable which later became so well known—"The same over-estimate of the enemy, the same tendency to interpret unfavorably the sights and sounds in front, the same hesitancy to throw in his whole force when his subordinate was engaged."

Treating of the comparative merit of the volunteers and regulars General Cox expresses the opinion that, man for man, the volunteers were always better men than the average of those recruited for the regular army and more amenable to discipline. The weakness of the volunteer system was in the officers, but this was soon rectified by a gradual sifting process. He does not accept the dictum that because a young man graduated at West Point he was a good officer, and comes to the conclusion that, before the Civil War, the intellectual education at the Military Academy was essentially the same, as far as it went, as that of any polytechnic school, and that in some of the volunteer regiments were "whole companies of private soldiers who would not have shunned a competitive examination with West Point classes on the studies of the Military Academy, excepting the technical engineering of fortifications."

Reviewing Pope's campaign before Washington he deals fairly with that officer, contends that no one who had any right to judge could question his ability or his zeal, that there was neither intelligence nor consistency in the vituperation with which he was covered. He shows on good authority that the notorious order of Pope from "Headquarters in the saddle," as well as others of that period which at the time were so severely criticized and made the occasion of a bitter and lasting enmity toward Pope on the part of most of the officers and men of the Army of the Potomac, were drafted under the direction of Mr. Stanton, Secretary of War, and given to General Pope to issue, with the idea of infusing vigor into the army, by stirring words which "would by implication condemn McClellan's policy of over-caution in military matters and over-tenderness toward rebel sympathizers and their property."

General Cox was in practical command of the Ninth Corps during the Maryland campaign of September, 1862. His services at South Mountain were brilliant, and at Antietam commendable. His description of the former is full and accurate, that of Antietam is marred by many inaccuracies, especially relating to movements on the Union right. He conclusively controverts the widely and generally accepted belief that Burnside was derelict in duty at Antietam in that he did not attack

and carry the bridge, now known as Burnside Bridge, early in the day. General Cox shows that orders were not given to make the attack until nearly or quite ten o'clock, and that the movement was promptly made. He exonerates Burnside from all blame and puts the responsibility for the failure to destroy Lee's army upon McClellan, who, under malign influences at and near headquarters, had reduced Sumner and Burnside from their proper rank as wing commanders and thrown the army corps into such relation with each other that unity of action was impossible and defeat invited.

The chapter on "McClellan and Politics" is a new and deeply interesting analysis. It is natural that in treating of General Burnside's command of the Department of the Ohio, and the movement into East Tennessee, General Cox, who had prominent part therein, should attempt at much length to defend his chief for not obeying Lincoln's and Stanton's oft-repeated orders to join Rosecrans before the battle of Chickamauga. This effort will not stand the test of the record, especially when it has become known since the war that General "Sam" Jones, who succeeded by his active demonstrations in holding Burnside back, had only 1500 effective men that could easily have been taken care of with two brigades.

In the discussion of the East Tennessee campaign, with which the first volume closes, severe and unwarranted criticisms of General Rosecrans begin, leading up to a version in the second volume of his relief after Chickamauga (related to General Cox by General Garfield, and undoubtedly reported correctly), which will oblige Army of the Cumberland men to tell the full inside history of that affair, which hitherto has been known to a very small circle.

This opening chapter of the second volume is painful reading for the veterans who served under General Rosecrans. Those who know the real facts will feel compelled by this long and specific statement of General Cox to disclose them. But they can only be indicated in this brief review. Stated concisely, they are almost the exact opposite of the present narrative. Instead of General Rosecrans being unnerved and dejected when, after riding clear of the break, the general and his staff halted to consider the situation, he was clear in his orders which he requested General Garfield to give in the immediate rear, and at Chattanooga, while he himself should ride back to Thomas. Garfield persistently argued that these were matters that General Rosecrans, the supreme authority, should properly and more efficiently attend to, while he, Garfield, would ride to Thomas. To this Rosecrans yielded. Garfield's ride was by a detour of eight miles, when the direct road of only two miles was clear of the enemy. Immediately after the battle, and while still chief-of-staff, he wrote Secretary Chase a letter, which has never yet been printed, severely criticizing his chief for going to Chattanooga and otherwise unjustly attacking him. Mr. Chase took the letter to Mr. Lincoln who read it to the Cabinet. It was the direct cause of General Rosecrans's removal. These are the mildest features of the full

story. As to this ride to Thomas, of which much is made, there was no meeting of the enemy except the passing within range of a few cavalry skirmishers, and the exposure of the ride was the merest child's play compared with the fire to which every staff-officer and every soldier on the field was at that moment subjected.

The treatment of General Rosecrans throughout the volumes is generally unfriendly in the extreme, though it consists largely in the repetition of venerable criticisms which are not history. Nor is it worthy treatment of an officer who, up to the time of the break in his lines on the second day at Chickamauga, had never lost a battle, and who unquestionably was the ablest strategist of the war. The old attacks upon this officer for resisting orders to advance before full preparations, first, from Murfreesboro, and next from Winchester, are given the old prominence, without the full vindication of result, which, for the Middle Tennessee campaign, was the driving of Bragg out of the state, over the Cumberlands and across the Tennessee river by strategy, with a Union loss of only 570 killed and wounded. For the Chattanooga campaign, the same tactics were repeated on a still larger scale, and Bragg was forced from his mountain stronghold without a battle. Every student of the records knows these facts now, and it is not the part of a fair historian to ignore them.

The chapters on the campaign in East Tennessee are comprehensive and interesting, and constitute in compact form a more complete history than has yet been written.

The initiation of the Atlanta campaign is preceded by an interesting presentation of the relations of General Sherman to his superiors and his subordinates, and the relations between General Johnson and Mr. Davis. General Cox's treatment of the Atlanta campaign keeps entirely out of sight the initial and most serious mistake of General Sherman in not promptly accepting General Thomas's advice to move through Snake Creek Gap, which the latter had found to be unguarded, upon Johnston's rear, and force him to battle. After a three days' delay this was found to be the only practicable move, but it was then too late to prevent the escape of Johnston which compelled the long campaign to Atlanta.

In like manner, the reader receives no impression of the needless and fruitless assault on Kennesaw Mountain, so costly in the loss of life. It is rather treated as a bold stroke called for by the existing conditions.

In spite of the fact that General Grant's map received by General Sherman on April 4, a month before the Atlanta campaign opened, has now been found, and has long been public in the *Atlas* of the War Record Series, which map clearly laid down a March to the Sea after the fall of Atlanta, General Cox, as in his former writings, continues to attribute the origin of this march to General Sherman. As is now well known, General Sherman's plan, which he finally induced General Grant to acquiesce in, differed from that of the latter in leaving Hood in his rear for Thomas to take care of, with an army yet to be assembled, and marching to Savannah with no enemy in his front.

While General Cox's details of Hood's movements against Thomas, culminating in the annihilation of the Confederate army, are full, and presented in most readable form, there is little to indicate the herculean task laid upon Thomas of gathering an army and resisting Hood, who, from May to September had stubbornly retarded Sherman's combined force. This account contains various criticisms upon Thomas's dispositions, and suggestions that this or that movement would have been better. But the destruction of an army is a better criterion by which to judge General Thomas in this campaign than the speculations even of General Cox.

The campaign of General Schofield's army, in which General Cox commanded the Twenty-third Corps, is deeply interesting and a valuable contribution to history. Especially is this true of the closing chapters on the Sherman-Johnston Convention, the surrender, and the disbandment of Johnston's army. Here, however, as in other important matters mentioned, the fact of great consequence to full discussion is not given proper prominence, namely that the first Sherman-Johnston terms, in nearly all their essentials, were written by Mr. Reagan, the Confederate Postmaster-General. This original paper is now in the War Department.

While the work will inevitably excite controversy, each of its fifty-one chapters will be found interesting, and none of them should be overlooked by any student of our war history.

H. V. BOYNTON.

The *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1899* is published in two volumes. The second, consisting of the fourth annual report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, and embracing the Correspondence of John C. Calhoun, will be reviewed in our next number. Vol. I. (Government Printing Office, pp. xii, 871), begins with the usual narrative account of the last annual meeting, (that of Boston and Cambridge, December, 1899), and with the inaugural address of President Rhodes. Of the sixteen papers which follow, seven, like Mr. Rhodes's address, were read at the meeting, and were summarized in that article of the REVIEW for April 1900 in which that meeting was dealt with. These are Professor E. G. Bourne's paper on the Proposed Absorption of Mexico in 1847-1848, that of Dr. W. G. Andrews on a Recent Service of Church History to the Church, Miss Putnam's on Robert Fruin, Professor Robinson's on Sacred and Profane History, that of Professor C. M. Andrews on the question whether recent European history should have a place in the college curriculum, and that of Professor Henry E. Bourne on the Colonial Problem. Nine other papers, read by title only at the meeting, are now printed. Dr. Carl Russell Fish, now of the University of Wisconsin, presents a series of tabular views showing the removals of officials by the President of the United States; Mr. F. H. Miller a careful compilation of the facts respecting legal qualifications for office in America. There is a good investigation of the *droit de banalité* during the French régime in Canada,

by Mr. W. B. Munro; and a long monograph on the career of Captain John Hart as governor of Maryland (1714-1720) by Professor Bernard C. Steiner of the Johns Hopkins University. Mr. Walter F. Prince examines the First Criminal Code of Virginia, chiefly with a view to the question of its authorship. Dr. O. G. Libby offers a critical dissection of Gordon's *History of the American Revolution*, the result of which seems to be to deprive it of nearly all value as an independent source. There are also three medieval studies: one by Mr. A. C. Howland, on the Origin of the Local Interdict, one by Mr. Henry L. Cannon, on the Poor Priests and the Rise of English Lollardry, and one by Professor E. W. Dow of the University of Michigan, on Langres in the Early Middle Ages. Two-thirds of the volume are thus composed. Next follows an extensive and well-devised bibliography of the study and teaching of history, by Mr. James I. Wyer, librarian of the University of Nebraska; and a series of titles of books in English history published in 1897 and 1898, selected and annotated by Mr. W. Dawson Johnston. Mr. Thomas M. Owen fills nearly two hundred pages with a comprehensive bibliography of the state of Mississippi, intended as "a catalogue, arranged alphabetically by authors, of books and articles relating to the State of Mississippi, its history, institutions and public characters," and also "to embrace the general literary product of Mississippi writers."

*The Letters of Cicero.* The whole extant Correspondence in Chronological Order, translated into English by Evelyn S. Shuckburgh, M.A. In four volumes. Vols. I.-III. (London, George Bell and Sons, 1899, 1900, pp. xlvii, 387; xviii, 406; xxvii, 381.) We received with pleasure the first announcement that the letters of Cicero were to be translated by a scholar so favorably known as Mr. Shuckburgh. The historian, the literary critic, and the philologist have contributed in recent years so much to the advancement of our knowledge on this subject that it was time that a worthy translation of these letters should be given to the English public. When we remember the high degree of excellence which has characterized many translations produced in the country of Jowett and Jebb, Conington and Munro, we cannot be satisfied with mediocrity in an English version of Cicero's correspondence. In the case of these very letters a high standard has been set in Jean's translation of selected letters and in the happy renderings scattered through the notes of the edition of Tyrrell and Purser. It is, accordingly, with a feeling of real regret that we are compelled to admit that the work before us shows an almost utter disregard of the literary form of the original and often, too, a lack of appreciation of its finer shades of thought. It is asking much of the translator to expect him to render with scrupulous care so large a body of literature, but it is asking much of the reader to expect him to wade through four volumes in which the attention, so far from being sustained by any attractions of style, is even distracted by the awkwardness of the English.

Each volume contains a useful introduction and ample foot-notes. We are glad to see that the author has, as a rule, used English rather

than French in translating the Greek which occurs in these letters. We could wish that he had carried this principle still further and had not introduced into his version so many foreign words and phrases. In the space of three lines (No. 228) we meet with Greek, Latin, and French. We can see no excuse for using a large number of Latin words for which English equivalents are easily found, such as *legatus*, *ordo*, *tribuni aerarii*, etc. It seems inexplicable that one who is so fond of Latin forms should employ such plurals as "Catiuses" and "Amafiniuses" (541). At times we meet with a painfully literal rendering as: "a great rumor" (120), "I was very weighty" (22), "I will bring you a pair of ears" (476), "one's eyes add to the pain" (537), "He will be unwilling that you should, as you would sooner or later, have time to thank for this rather than his favour" (284). At other times the author is very free in his translation and introduces colloquial expressions and slang phrases which are not in harmony with the tone and spirit of the original. Errors in English grammar and in the use of words are not infrequent, and at times there is an incorrect use of tenses which entirely destroys the thought. For example Cicero says in reference to a future event: "If you were to be at Rome, I should have no fear," but this we find translated: "If you were there when this was going on, I should not have been at all afraid" (227). Often the spirit of a passage is lost owing to an apparent lack of appreciation of the special force of individual words which strike the key-note of the thought, as *heros* (22), *gloriolae* (133). When we find in perhaps the most impressive passage of the most perfect letter (554) of the whole collection such a translation as "the corpses of so many towns lie in helpless ruins," we feel that a positive wrong is done Latin literature.

ALBERT GRANGER HARKNESS.

*The Story of Assisi*, by Lina Duff Gordon. (London, J. M. Dent and Co., 1900, pp. 372.) This book undertakes to do three things: (1) to give an historical sketch of Assisi, (2) to trace the life of St. Francis and the development of his order, (3) to furnish the traveller with a handbook of Assisi's monuments. These aims are nowhere announced in this categorical fashion, but may fairly be said to be involved in the treatment.

With regard to the history of Assisi the author finds that the chief interest lies in the struggles with Perugia. She dismisses the origin of these struggles with a reference to Perugia's "inborn love of fighting" and "to her restless spirit" (p. 19). It is evident without a further word of comment that a writer who contents himself with this simple-minded point of view may save himself much inconvenient trouble, but will not raise the darkness hovering over the Italian commune.

The life of St. Francis and the origin of his order have been treated with such undeniable sympathy and acumen by Paul Sabatier that a reader is justified in demanding an equally successful narrative from every later writer. Sabatier understood that his task was, while making

St. Francis, the *man*, plausible to us by an affectionate study of the early Franciscan documents, yet to follow the successive phases of his order, the *institution*, with historical severity. The life of the saint, as treated in this book, lacks the authentic touch, and the facts of the order are blurred in a general background of circumstances without anything like relief.

By far the greater part of the work is concerned with the third purpose, the creation of a guide to the city's monuments. And here, it may be immediately observed, the author maintains a surer footing, due to her willingness to follow a number of excellent predecessors in this field. Among her authorities she evidently and wisely gives the preference to Mr. Bernhard Berenson, echoes of whose resonant intonation mount from almost every page. A regrettable disfigurement of this portion of the work is furnished by occasional attempts at emotional or rhetorical writing. While it may be granted that for any one who has gazed long at the Umbrian hills, the temptation must be great to produce a new volume of *Sensations d'Italie*, still it is to be insisted that that kind of thing must be superlatively well done to prove acceptable. Such passages as the ascent of Subasio (p. 86) and the youth of Giotto (p. 169) will only be the better for a little pruning; occasional descriptions, however, such as the *perdono d'Assisi* (353 f.) have a real charm.

To sum up, it is fair to say that though the book fails to meet its first two purposes, it constitutes the most valuable guide to Assisi of this compass that is now attainable.

FERDINAND SCHWILL.

Under the title of *Zauberwahn, Inquisition und Hexenprozess im Mittelalter und die Entstehung der grossen Hexenverfolgung* (Munich and Leipzig, Oldenbourg, pp. xv, 538) there has just appeared from the pen of Joseph Hansen, the well-known archivist of Cologne, the most important monograph of our time on the general history of the witch-persecution. It is, indeed, the most elaborate of all studies as to the origin of the great delusion. The book (which forms the twelfth volume of the *Historische Zeitschrift's Historische Bibliothek*) is to be supplemented by a volume (already in the press) of *Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Hexenwahns und der Hexenverfolgung im Mittelalter*. So far as he has gone his work must take the place long held by the book of Soldan as the standard authority upon its subject; and it is to be hoped that what he now gives us is but the first half of a comprehensive history of the persecution.

G. L. B.

*The Life, Unpublished Letters and Philosophical Regimen of Anthony, Earl of Shaftesbury, Author of the "Characteristics,"* edited by Benjamin Rand, Ph.D. (London: Swan Sonnenschein; New York: The Macmillan Co., pp. xxxi, 535). This volume includes some material which has been published before, but the larger portion appears in print for the

first time. The new material is partly of philosophical, partly of historical interest. The most important part of the book for the student of philosophy is what the editor has called the *Regimen*, for which Shaftesbury's own name was *Askemata* (exercises). This occupies 272 pages, and consists of a series of reflections and monitions modeled largely in both form and contents on the writings of Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius. Some passages lay more emphasis upon the functions of reason and will in the moral life than we find in the *Characteristics*, where the stress falls upon *feeling* as the most important factor. Whether such passages mark an earlier stage in Shaftesbury's philosophy, or are rather an indication that he pitched the note of his own striving in a more strenuous key than that of his essays for the public, can not be determined from the text, as the editor has not preserved the chronological order of the original, but has ordered the contents under topics.

The historical interest of the volume lies in the letters to prominent men, written for the most part between 1700 and 1712. These show Shaftesbury the earnest supporter of the Whig cause, the promoter of a better understanding between England and Holland in the struggle against Louis, the faithful friend of the French Protestants, the statesman to whose vision it seemed possible to carry "the point of liberty and balance further than first intended or thought of, so as to bring not Europe only but Asia and in a manner the whole world under one community; or at least to such a correspondence and intercourse of good offices and mutual succor as to render it a more humane world than it was ever known." The private letters show a sincere generous character, worthy of the man who gave a new and distinctly upward turn to the ethical and social theories of the eighteenth century.

JAMES H. TUFTS.

*Logs of the Great Sea-Fights, 1794-1805*, edited by T. Sturges Jackson, Rear-Admiral. Vol. II. (London, Navy Records Society, pp. 343). The plan of Admiral Jackson's second volume is precisely like that of the first, which we reviewed last year (V. 793). That volume embraced the battles of the First of June, St. Vincent and Camperdown. The present is devoted to the Battle of the Nile, Copenhagen and Trafalgar. In each fight the record is made almost complete, for there are logs or official journals for nearly every vessel engaged, even including in the case of the last two combats (it will be remembered that at the Nile there were no secondary vessels), the logs of frigates and sloops and bomb-vessels and fire-ships, which often, from their position, external to the main conflict, are able to afford an interesting contribution of fact. As largely as possible, and especially in the case of Trafalgar, the record presented in the logs is supplemented by letters written within a few days after the fights by the commanders or lieutenants of ships. Captain Hood's letter from Aboukir, that of Captain Miller, already printed by Nicolas, and that of Rear-Admiral Graves from

Copenhagen, are especially interesting. That Nelson ignored a positive signal from Sir Hyde Parker at Copenhagen is made abundantly certain. In the case of Trafalgar the records printed cover not only the day of the combat, but the days immediately succeeding, which severely tested the energy and seamanship of the fleet.

Admiral Jackson's volumes have presented the most perfect possible body of materials for the study of these six great battles. It is needless to say that these records make dry reading for the non-professional reader. He will not be able to read without emotion the bare and formal record: "Partial firing continued until 4.30, when a victory having been reported to the Right Honourable Lord Viscount Nelson, K.B. and Commander-in-Chief, he then died of his wound;" but it is an emotion imported from other narratives. To the serious student of naval warfare by sailing ships, however, these volumes must forever be indispensable.

*With Both Armies in South Africa*, by Richard Harding Davis. (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, pp. xii, 238.) This volume, covering the personal adventures of a clever newspaper correspondent on both sides of the line, possesses the keen zest of injudicious frankness. A campaign to-day evokes such an avalanche of publication that to be fresh one must go beyond mere war matter or mere literary excellence. This the author has done. Mr. Davis sympathized with the under dog, though all his friends were in the British camp. First visiting the "corrugated zinc dust-bin of Ladysmith," he adds a few colors to the siege and relief we already know; then making his way via Lourenço Marques to Pretoria, the first distant view of its dark-green poplars and red-topped roofs oddly suggested Florence, an impression the ox-teams in the streets alongside tramway and victoria speedily dissipated. Among the British, at home and in camp, Mr. Davis found much "hysterical" war fever; among the Boers none. The latter are not 'cute and boorish, as the Briton declares them; "I have never seen an uncivil Boer," says Mr. Davis. Soundly berated by the Briton, the Boer had no ill words for his opponent; and except the British prisoners, no sign of war existed in Pretoria. That to crush thirty thousand potential soldiers, England should have required so vast a force seems odd to us all; and our author justly condemns the "good pig-sticking" at Elandslaagte, and the lying unburied three days of the killed at Spion Kop. He contrasts Mr. Kruger's personal simplicity and official state; suggests a likeness to Cleveland, and refers to his bitterness against the British, while President Steyn's attitude was one of amused tolerance. In commenting on the good treatment of the British prisoners, Mr. Davis dubs the action of some of their officers "unsportsmanlike, ungentlemanly and foolish," and maintains that the Boer has been murdered and robbed because the Briton coveted his watch and chain—strong words. The small number of Boers who repeatedly stood off the hosts of English evokes his admiration, and the battle of Sand River is vividly described.

In truth it has been a strange war; one in which England has learned what will make for her eventual good. In war failure teaches lessons, not success. When Pretoria was taken, however, would it not have been more generous as well as far-sighted to make an end of it by liberal terms, rather than demand unconditional surrender with all its *sequelae*?

This book is full of picturesque interest, though so unnecessarily outspoken that one wonders whether Mr. Davis will hereafter be as much at home in Piccadilly or Pall Mall.

THEODORE AVRAULT DODGE.

*Roger Ludlow, The Colonial Lawmaker*, by John M. Taylor. (New York and London, G. P. Putnam's Sons, pp. 166.) This book is addressed to the general reader rather than the historical student. A few new facts are brought to light; but they were hardly sufficient to require a volume to put them in their proper setting. The bibliography which is appended shows that the author has spared no pains in collecting his material; but it is to be regretted that he has seldom referred to his authority for any statement, except in so general a way as to furnish little assistance to one who desires to verify it. The volume has neither notes nor index.

A letter of Ludlow's is quoted (p. 70) which brings into light one phase of his character which has been little noticed heretofore in New England history. In 1637, during the first Pequot war, he writes, and with evident sincerity, from Windsor, to Pynchon, at Agawam, at a time when each was directing the defensive operations in his neighborhood:

"I must confess both you and ourselves do stand merely by the power of our God: therefore he must and ought to have all the praise of it."

The most valuable part of Mr. Taylor's work is to be found in the sixteenth chapter. Here we have the results of new investigations of his own, which are of great interest. What became of Ludlow after he left Connecticut, in 1654, was wholly unknown until within recent years, when he was definitely traced back to England. Mr. Taylor now takes up the story where Waters, Stiles, Chester and Beers had left it, and shows us that after his return he fulfilled important functions under the English government. He went from Connecticut to Virginia, and thence to Ireland (p. 145). A few months later, after a short visit to England, we find him placed by the Irish Council on a special commission of seven, headed by the Chief Justice, to determine all claims as to forfeited lands in Ireland. This was followed in a few weeks by his being put on the commission of the peace for the county of Cork (p. 148), apparently as a justice of the quorum. Mr. Taylor argues with much reason that these appointments would not have been made so soon after Ludlow's arrival, had he not been invited by Cromwell to return to Ireland for that very purpose. Failing to get the ministers of New England to remove there,

he turned to their statesmen. Ludlow was named, some years later, on a new commission for a similar purpose, created by direct order of the Lord Protector (p. 154), and also made a master in chancery. As late as 1664 he was living in Dublin, then being a man of seventy-four (p. 156).

Mr. Taylor does not overrate Ludlow's contribution to the law of Connecticut. He framed the first colonial code, and did it so well that, after two centuries, most of his titles were still preserved in force, wholly in substance, and largely in form (p. 102). Only a skilled lawyer and wise jurist could have accomplished this work, and that Ludlow is the acknowledged author of the code of 1650 gives strong ground for the inference that his was the pen that gave legal shape and precision to the political ideas which, under the lead of Thomas Hooker, were put into the Constitution of 1639.

*Philip Vickers Fithian : Journal and Letters, 1767-1774*, Student at Princeton College 1770-72, Tutor at Nomini Hall in Virginia 1773-74. Edited for the Princeton Historical Association by J. Rogers Williams. (Princeton, University Library, pp. 344.) The new historical society at Princeton could hardly find a more interesting human document than this for its first publication. Through Mr. Williams's kindness, the readers of this REVIEW were given a taste of the quality of Fithian's diary in a previous volume (V. 290-319). The whole twelve-months' journal is now printed in full, and very handsomely, though we think it a blemish that the habit of the manuscript in using dashes instead of periods is followed. Most of the volume before us is made up of this diary, with its vivid, gossipy and entertaining picture of life on a great Virginian plantation just before the Revolution. Prefixed to this, however, are several letters of college days, written either by Fithian or to him. They reveal to us a thoroughly good, but lively and pleasant boy, an earnest student, a good son, a youth having in him the making of the devoted patriot he afterwards showed himself. They give many pleasant glimpses of college life, for which unfortunately no journal of Fithian's is extant. At the end are printed ten letters written from Virginia, of which the most interesting is a long letter of advice addressed to Fithian's classmate John Peck, who was to succeed him as tutor to the children of Councillor Carter. The letter marked as addressed to Pelatiah Webster can hardly have been written to the publicist, a man of forty-nine. There are several really beautiful pictures in the book—the noble old avenue of poplars at Nomini Hall, the Longstreet House at Princeton, Yeocomico Church, the Tayloe house, Mount Airy, and the portrait of Councillor Carter by Sir Joshua Reynolds. Thanks are due to Mr. Williams and the new society for bringing forward so good a document.

In the fifteenth volume of the *Collections of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin* (Madison, pp. 491) the first place in point of inter-

est belongs to a diary kept by one of the Swiss immigrants who in 1845 founded New Glarus, a diary kept from the time of his leaving his home in Switzerland till his arrival in the new home, and now translated from the original German. Next perhaps come the reports which Rev. Cutting Marsh, Presbyterian missionary from 1831 on, addressed to the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions and the Scottish Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, respecting the Stockbridge Indians among whom he labored; and the journal kept by Alfred Brunson, Methodist preacher, on a journey from Pennsylvania to Wisconsin in 1835. We should rather say, first among the new materials; for great interest attaches to the narrative by Madame Thérèse Baird concerning early life in the territory, a continuation of her Mackinaw reminiscences. The editor of the volume, Mr. Reuben G. Thwaites, has also added narratives derived from interviews with old French and other settlers, and a longer body of reminiscences, of pioneering in the Wisconsin lead-region, by Theodore Rodolf. There is also a government report on the region in 1831, by Samuel Stambaugh, U. S. Indian agent at Green Bay.

## NOTES AND NEWS

Moses Coit Tyler, professor of American History in Cornell University, died on December 28. Born at Griswold, Connecticut, in 1835, he was graduated at Yale in 1857. He was a pastor at Poughkeepsie for two years during the war time. From 1867 to 1881 he was professor of English literature at the University of Michigan, and from 1881 to the time of his death he occupied the chair of American history at Cornell University. He was a most graceful speaker, and a writer of remarkable gifts, whose *History of American Literature* may fairly be called a classic. He was also a man of most engaging traits, friendly, sympathetic, serene and refined, and had a large circle of friends. He was one of the principal founders of the American Historical Association. The work above mentioned, by which he is best known, was continued in 1897 by his *Literary History of the American Revolution*. In 1888 he printed, in the "American Statesmen" series, a book on Patrick Henry which was a model of what a small biography should be. At the time of his death Professor Tyler was first vice-president of the American Historical Association, and but for his death he would have been chosen its president.

The Right Rev. Dr. Mandell Creighton, Bishop of London, died on January 14. Born in Carlisle in 1843, he studied at Oxford, and became a fellow and tutor of Merton College. After passing some years as vicar of Embleton and an honorary canon of Newcastle, he in 1884 was elected to the Dixie professorship of ecclesiastical history at Cambridge. He had already published the first two volumes of his chief work, a *History of the Papacy during the Reformation*, and minor books on the *Age of Elizabeth* and on Simon de Montfort. Other small books on Cardinal Wolsey and on Carlisle followed. In 1887 he published two more volumes of his great work—a work distinguished as much for candor and breadth of view as for scholarship—and in 1894 a fifth. Meantime, on the inauguration of the *English Historical Review*, in 1886, Canon Creighton became its editor, and he continued as such till 1891. He then became Bishop of Peterborough. From that see he was translated to London in 1897. A prelate of moderate views, of great executive capacity, of distinguished bearing and of high repute for scholarship, it was believed that he was destined for still higher preferment. His great historical work was, of necessity, permanently interrupted when he went to the see of London. In 1886 Professor Creighton visited this country, representing Emmanuel College and the University of Cambridge at the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Harvard College.

Jacques Victor Albert, Duc de Broglie, died on January 19, aged nearly eighty. Born in 1821, he was already a member of the French Academy in 1863, having published in 1856 a remarkable work on *L'Église et l'Empire Romain au IV<sup>e</sup> Siècle*, which he continued by works on Julian and Theodosius. As a member of the National Assembly and a leader of the Right Centre he did much to procure the downfall of M. Thiers in 1873, and he was prime minister under President MacMahon from 1873 to 1874 and in 1877. For nine years he was a senator. After the close of his political career he occupied himself again with history. The most noted of his books was *Le Secret du Roi* (1878), dealing with the private diplomacy of Louis XV. Later works were *Frédéric II. et Marie Thérèse*, 1882, *Frédéric II. et Louis XV.*, 1884, *Marie-Thérèse Impératrice*, 1888, *Maurice de Saxe et le Marquis d'Argenson*, 1893. He also edited the memoirs of Talleyrand published in 1891.

We have also to announce, with much regret, the recent death of William Wirt Henry, LL.D., of Richmond. He was born in 1831, the grandson of Patrick Henry and of William Wirt, and worthily maintained the best traditions of Virginia gentlemen of the old school. He was once president of the American Historical Association, and for several years was president of the Virginia Historical Society. In 1891 he published *Patrick Henry; Life, Correspondence and Speeches*, an elaborate biography in three volumes, which also forms by far the best history of Virginia for the period involved.

When Professor E. A. Ross of Leland Stanford University was dismissed in November last under circumstances well known to the public, Dr. George E. Howard, principal professor of history and senior member of the faculty, made a vigorous public protest. In January President Jordan demanded that he should either apologize or resign. He of course resigned, and has been followed by Professor David E. Spencer, and by others not of the historical department. Dr. Gaillard T. Lapsley of Cambridge and Mr. Joseph P. Warren of Boston have accepted temporary positions in that department, caused by these resignations.

Professor Charles Henry Hull, hitherto of the department of economics and finance in Cornell University, has been elected professor of American history to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Professor Moses Coit Tyler.

Professor Herbert B. Adams, after twenty-five years of energetic and fruitful work for the Johns Hopkins University, has resigned its chair of history on account of ill health. We are sure that he is attended into his retirement by the best wishes of the profession, of which he has been so conspicuously useful a member.

It is expected that, after the completion of the present volume of this REVIEW, the position of managing editor will be assumed by Professor Andrew C. McLaughlin of the University of Michigan.

Professor William MacDonald of Bowdoin College is to succeed Dr. J. F. Jameson as professor of history in Brown University.

In the second number of the *Revue de Synthèse Historique* M. Xenopol, defending his previous utterances, discusses "Les Faits de Répétition et les Faits de Succession;" M. A. Bossert essays portraits of Niebuhr, Ranke, Sybel and Mommsen; M. Henri Berr discusses Pascal and his place in the history of ideas. There is a general survey of the history of mathematics, and a composite article reviewing, in various departments, the representation of the historical sciences in the congresses of 1900 at Paris.

An international congress of the historical sciences will be held at Rome in the spring of 1902. There will be three sections, devoted respectively to methodology, to ancient and to modern history. Correspondence respecting membership and attendance may be addressed to Professor Ettore Pais, via Caracciolo 8, Naples.

A second edition of Mr. A. P. C. Griffin's *List of Books relating to the Theory of Colonization, etc.* (Washington, Government Printing Office) has just appeared.

#### ANCIENT HISTORY.

Messrs. Charles Scribner's Sons have brought out *Social Life of the Hebrews*, by the Rev. E. Day, being Number 3 of the Semitic Series, edited by Professor J. A. Craig.

The Warburton lectures for 1880-1884, by Dr. Alfred Edersheim, are published by Messrs. Longmans, Green and Co., under the title, *Prophecy and History in Relation to the Messiah*, with two appendices on the arrangement, analysis, and recent criticism of the Pentateuch.

The Macmillan Company have published a new and revised edition in three volumes of Dr. J. G. Frazer's *The Golden Bough*.

The same company has just published *A History of Rome for High Schools and Academies*, by Dr. George W. Botsford. In its method and scope this book is similar to the author's *History of Greece*.

The Clarendon Press announces that it will shortly publish a volume on *The Civil and Criminal Procedure of Cicero's Time*, by Mr. A. H. J. Greenidge.

It is understood that Professor Charles H. Haskins, of the University of Wisconsin, is engaged upon an edition of the *Germania* of Tacitus.

#### EARLY CHURCH HISTORY.

Among the books in preparation at the Clarendon Press are Eusebius's *Praeparatio Evangelica*, edited and translated by Rev. E. H. Gifford, D.D.; *Eusebii Chronicorum Liber*, edited with facsimiles, by J. K. Fotheringham, M.A.; and *Latin Versions of the Canons of the Greek Councils of the Fourth and Fifth Centuries*, Part II., by C. H. Turner, M.A.

M. H. Welter has now brought out six volumes of his photographic reprint of Mansi, extending to A. D. 451.

## MEDIEVAL HISTORY.

Mr. Guy le Strange, in his *Baghdad during the Abbasid Caliphate* (Clarendon Press), has devoted himself chiefly to the topographical antiquities of that city. Eight plans constructed by him form the main basis of his text. Twenty-one chapters of topography are followed by three containing a sketch of the history of the city of Baghdad during the period named.

*A History of Exploration and Geographical Science from the Opening of the Tenth to the Middle of the Thirteenth Century* (A. D. 900-1250), by Mr. C. Raymond Beazley, the continuation of the author's previous work on the period from the conversion of the Roman Empire to 900 A. D., is announced by Mr. John Murray.

M. E. Chatelain has rendered an important service to medieval palaeography by his *Introduction à la Lecture des Notes Tironiennes*, published by the author, and accompanied with an album of eighteen illustrative plates.

Mr. Henry C. Lea's *History of the Inquisition* is being issued in a French translation. Two volumes have already appeared. Professor Paul Fredericq has contributed an introduction, with a bibliography. The translation is by M. Salomon Reinach. The work is being extensively quoted and used by the Liberal party in French politics. Mr. Lea's pamphlet on *The Dead Hand* (Philadelphia, Dornan, 1900) has also been translated.

## MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY.

Six years ago Father L. J. M. Cros, S. J., published a first series of *Documents Nouveaux* on St. Francis Xavier. Before printing more he has been persuaded by his publisher to bring out an extensive biography of the saint, for the general reader, *Saint François de Xavier; Sa Vie et ses Lettres* (Paris, Toulouse, Privat, pp. lvi, 494, xl, 550). It is, however, so richly "documented" as to present almost an autobiography. Meanwhile the editors of the *Monumenta Historica Societatis Jesu* have published a first volume of *Monumenta Xaveriana ex Autographis vel ex Antiquioribus Exemplis collecta* (Madrid, Avrial, xxxii, 1030, xxxii, 1030), embracing many letters and other writings and having prefixed to it a valuable life of the saint written in 1574, by Father Manoel Teixeira, a companion of the last days of Francis, and Father Alessandro Valignani.

The Hakluyt Society will publish, this year, *Mendana's Voyage to the Solomon Islands in 1568*, in two volumes.

Dr. Julius Beloch, in the *Zeitschrift für Socialwissenschaft*, III. 11, attempts an estimate of the population of Europe about A.D. 1600. He concludes that approximately there were in Italy thirteen millions, in France sixteen, in Germany twenty, in all Europe perhaps a hundred millions.

*The Life of Abd-ur Rahman, Amir of Afghanistan, G. C. B., G. C. S. I.*, edited by Sultan Mahomed Khan, in two volumes (London, Murray), contains, first, a translation from the Persian of the narrative of the Amir's early life, written by himself; this is followed by an account of his government of his country and of his daily life and occupations, taken down in his own words by Sultan Mahomed Khan when acting as his state secretary.

#### GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

For the promotion of the projected School of Advanced Historical Studies in London, a strong executive committee has been formed, after a meeting for organization, at which Professor James Bryce presided. The result may be either the success of the proposed school as an independent foundation, or the adoption of the project in some form by the University of London or the School of Political Science.

In the *Revue des Questions Historiques* for January Father A. Zimmermann gives a summary review of the recent English historical publications.

The British Government has published a *Calendar of the Close Rolls, Edward I., 1272-1279*.

The three supplemental volumes of the *Dictionary of National Biography* will, in the main, be devoted to the closing years of the last century. An exception will, nevertheless, be made as regards Queen Victoria, the Bishop of London, and a few other distinguished personages whose lives ended in the early weeks of the present year.

*An Introduction to the Industrial and Social History of England*, by Professor Edward P. Cheyney of the University of Pennsylvania (Macmillan) is intended as a text-book for the use of college classes. The thirteenth century is made the starting-point for a continuous study of the economic conditions of the people down to the present time. The plan of the book, as set forth in the announcements, seems excellent.

It is understood that text-books of English history are in preparation by Professors Benjamin Terry of Chicago, Andrews of Bryn Mawr and Cheyney of the University of Pennsylvania respectively.

The Macmillan Company will shortly publish a volume of documents for the use of students of the history, and particularly of the constitutional history, of England, prepared by Professors George B. Adams of Yale University and H. Morse Stephens of Cornell!

Mr. Alexander Gardner, of Paisley, has ready for publication *A History of the Church in Scotland from the Earliest Times down to the Present Day*, by Mr. John Macpherson.

The corporation of Leicester announce a second volume of the *Records of the Borough of Leicester*, extending from 1327 to 1509, and edited, like its predecessor, by the competent hand of Miss Mary Bateson (London, C. J. Clay and Sons).

Messrs. Archibald Constable and Co. have just published the *Paston Letters, 1422-1509*, a reprint of the edition of 1872-1875, which contained some five hundred letters until then unpublished, and to which are now added others, edited by Mr. James Gairdner, of the Public Record Office.

Professor Gross's *Sources and Literature of English History*, reviewed on a preceding page, stops with the year 1485. It is understood that a volume supplementing it upon much the same plan, and extending from 1485 to the present time, is to be prepared by Professor Wolfgang Michael of Freiburg.

It is understood that Sir Clements Markham and Mr. Raymond Beazley are at work upon a reprint of Hakluyt's *Voyages*, and that the first volume will appear this year.

*Mary Queen of Scots, and Who Wrote the Casket Letters?* by Mr. Samuel Cowan, will shortly be issued by Messrs. Sampson Low, Marston and Co. The work will give the results of long and careful study of the much-discussed questions of the authenticity and authorship of the letters.

The New Amsterdam Book Company announce *The Rising of 1745*, with a bibliography of Jacobite history (1689-1788), by Mr. C. S. Terry of Aberdeen, Scotland, forming a new volume in the series of *Scottish History from Contemporary Writers*.

The Clarendon Press announces that it will shortly publish Vols. VII. and VIII. of Professor Thorold Rogers's *History of Agriculture and Prices*.

*Life in Scotland a Hundred Years Ago, as Reflected in the Old Statistical Accounts of Scotland, 1791-1799*, by Mr. James Murray (Paisley, Alexander Gardner) is based upon the twenty-one volumes of Sir John Sinclair's famous compilation of information derived from the ministers of the respective parishes.

Messrs. Methuen announce a new edition of Mr. E. L. S. Horsburgh's *Waterloo*, in which important alterations have been made. An appendix and an index have been added.

*Under England's Flag from 1804 to 1809* (Macmillan) is the memoirs, diary, and correspondence of Captain Charles Boothby, of the Royal Engineers, compiled by the last surviving members of his family.

Messrs. Longmans announce for immediate publication a new issue of *Queen Victoria*, by Richard R. Holmes, F.S.A., Librarian to the Queen. The whole of the text, excepting the last chapter, was approved and authorized by Queen Victoria.

Mr. John Murray has in press *The Reminiscences of Sir Edward Malet*, who was for ten years English Ambassador at Berlin, and has represented his country at Washington, Pekin, Athens, and Rome, as well as at Paris during the Commune.

Mr. Henry W. Lucy has continued a well-known and very interesting series by bringing out (London, Arrowsmith) *A Diary of the Unionist Parliament, 1895-1900*, conceived upon the same plan as his previous "diaries."

*Life and Letters of Thomas Henry Huxley*, in two volumes, by his son, Leonard Huxley (D. Appleton and Co.), is a presentation of Huxley's character and personality, for the most part by means of his letters. These are published chronologically, save where, in a few instances, the letters relating to some special interest or episode are massed in a chapter by themselves. Mr. P. Chalmers Mitchell's *Thomas Henry Huxley* is brought out in this country by Messrs. Putnam.

Messrs. Longmans, Green and Co. announce that they have made arrangements for the publication of a life of the late Bishop of London. It will be written by Mrs. Creighton, who will be much obliged if any persons who have letters from the bishop will kindly lend them to her. They may be sent to Fulham Palace, London, S. W.

The Irish Text Society intends to publish, in its medieval series, the earliest version of the *Lebor Gabala*, together with the poems of Eochaid hua Flainn and other antiquaries of the tenth and eleventh centuries on which it is based; the genealogical collections in the great medieval vellums; and the medieval grammatical treatises. In its modern series it proposes to print The Death of Murtach son of Erc and The Expedition of Dathi to the Alps.

Mr. G. C. Moore Smith has in preparation *The Autobiography of Lt.-General Sir Harry Smith, of Aliwal, G.C.B.* (London, Murray.)

Messrs. Smith Elder and Co. have published *A Life-time in South Africa; being the Recollections of the First Premier of Natal*, by the Hon. Sir John Robinson, K.C.M.G. The book contains an account of the author's personal experiences, followed by chapters treating of the Outgoers, the Governors, the Voortrekkers, the Settlers as Pioneers, Law-makers, Traders, Civilizers and Neighbors, the Natives, the War, its Genesis and its Revelations, and the Outlook.

The first volume of *The Times History of the War*, edited by Mr. L. S. Amery of All Souls College, Oxford, has been published. It covers the period to the outbreak of war.

*The South African War, 1899-1900*, by Major S. L. Norris (London, Murray) is confined to the military aspects of the war. There are a number of appendices giving the conventions of Pretoria and London, the National Union's Manifesto, and the Majesfontein, Stormberg, and Spion Kop despatches. The book contains several maps.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: F. E. Fox, *Roman Suffolk* (Archaeological Journal, 226); C. A. Moore, *Oriental Cults in Britain* (Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, XI.); F. W. Maitland, *The*

*Corporation Sole* (Law Quarterly Review, October); B. Williams, *The Foreign Policy of England under Walpole*, IV. (English Historical Review, January).

#### FRANCE.

An important committee, including such scholars as M. Imbart de la Tour, M. Chatelain, M. Boulay de la Meurthe, M. Fournier, M. Baudrillart, and M. Noël Valois, has been formed for the publication of scholarly documentary publications illustrating the history of the Church in France. Documents of the Vatican archives as well as of those in France will be undertaken. The usual form of publication will be that of the calendar, with full texts of the most important pieces. The general name of the series will be *Archives de l'Histoire Religieuse de la France*. Among the works proposed are: *Registre des Procès-verbaux de la Faculté de Théologie de Paris*, ed. Chatelain and Denifle; letters of Cardinal du Bellay; instructions given to the French ambassadors in Germany at the time of the Reformation; and, of especial importance, the reports of the papal nuncios in France.

The first volume of M. Lavis's co-operative *Histoire de France* (Hachette) has appeared. It comprises pre-Roman and Roman Gaul, and is written by M. G. Bloch. Part 2 of Vol. II., on the first Capetians, by M. Achille Luchaire, has also appeared; Part 1 of that volume, by MM. Bayet and Kleinlausz, on Christianity and the barbarians, the Merovingians and Carolingians, will be somewhat delayed. The whole work will consist of eight volumes, of the same size and price as those of Lavisse and Rambaud's *Histoire Générale*. Of this latter work, by the way, the twelfth and concluding volume, embracing the years from 1870 to 1900, was lately brought out.

Three important volumes of cartularies have lately been published: Vol. III. of the *Cartulaire de l'Église d'Autun*, edited by M. de Charmasse (Paris, Pedone), which contains 202 interesting charters bearing dates from 897 to 1399, and an able introduction on the medieval history of landed property in Burgundy; the *Cartulaire de l'Église d'Angoulême*, edited by the Abbé Nanglard (Angoulême, Chasseignac), consisting of documents of the tenth, eleventh and twelfth centuries; and the second part of M. Lacave-La Plagne-Barris's *Cartulaire du Chapitre d'Auch* (Paris, Champion).

M. Marcellin Boudet, in his *Thomas de la Marche, Bâtard de France, et ses Aventures, 1318-1361* (Paris, Champion) relates the story of a quite extraordinary and romantic career and of an interesting person, a captain in the Hundred Years' War, whom he supposes to have been the son of Philippe de Valois and Blanche of Burgundy, countess of La Marche.

In the "Collection de Textes pour servir," etc. (Paris, Picard) M. Gustave Fagniez has just brought out the second volume (pp. lxxx, 345) of his *Documents relatifs à l'Histoire de l'Industrie et du Commerce en*

*France.* This volume relates to the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and embraces 166 documents, carefully chosen and often of great interest.

M. G. Bonet-Maury's *Histoire de la Liberté de Conscience en France depuis l'Édit de Nantes jusqu'à juillet 1870* (Paris, Alcan) has, we judge from the announcements, a certain close relation to the lectures which he gave in this country.

In the *Annales* of the University of Lyons M. Émile Bourgeois has given, from the author's manuscripts at Berlin, a new edition of Ezekiel Spanheim's *Relation de la Cour de France en 1690* (Paris, Picard) with a corrected text and many useful notes.

The Marquis Costa de Beauregard has made an interesting contribution to the memoir-literature of the Revolution and Empire by publishing a selection from the papers of the Count de la Ferronays, an enlightened émigré who was much employed in the diplomacy of the exiled Bourbon princes, and from the autobiographical sketches written by his countess, *En Émigration; Souvenirs tirés des Papiers du Comte Auguste de la Ferronays, 1777-1814* (Paris, Plon, pp. 428).

M. Aulard's fourth volume of police and newspaper pieces called *Paris pendant la Réaction Thermidorienne et sous le Directoire* (Cerf) extends from May 11, 1797, to July 20, 1798, and contributes much to the understanding of the revolution of 18 Fructidor.

Colonel H. de Poyen, after long continued researches in the archives of the French departments of marine and colonies, has printed a most careful military history of the war of Leclerc and Rochambeau in St. Domingo, *Histoire Militaire de la Révolution de Saint-Domingue* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, pp. 555).

Students of the military history of Napoleon will find profit in an *Étude sur le Service d'État Major pendant les Guerres du Premier Empire* (Paris, Chapelot) by Lieutenant-Colonel de Philip, of the French artillery, formerly a member of the general staff of the army.

M. Henri Berton, a lawyer and a friend of Émile Ollivier, has published (Paris, Alcan) a bulky book marked by much care and fairness on *L'Évolution Constitutionnelle du Second Empire*.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Abbé Vacandard, *Un Évêque Mérovingien; Saint Ouen dans son Diocèse* (Revue des Questions Historiques, January); A. Liard, *Saint-Simon et les États Généraux* (Revue Historique, March); F. T. Perrens, *Le premier Abbé Dubois*, II. (Revue Historique, January); L. Sciout, *Les Élections à la Convention, d'après les Procès-Verbaux des Assemblées Électorales des Départements* (Revue des Questions Historiques, January); A. Stern, *Sieyès et la Constitution de l'An III* (Révolution Française, XX. 4); G. Caudrillier, *Le Complot de l'An XII.*, II. (Revue Historique, March); M. Philippson, *La Paix d'Amiens et la Politique Générale de Napoléon I.* (Revue Historique, March); F. Masson, *Les Préliminaires du Divorce Imperial*

(*Revue de Paris*, November 15, December 1); A. Stern, *La Mission Secrète du Marquis de Bellune, Agent du Prince de Polignac à Lisbonne, 1830* (*Revue Historique*, January).

#### ITALY, SPAIN, PORTUGAL.

Signora Jessie White Mario has made a selection from the writings of Mazzini (Florence, Sansoni) for the series of Italian classics which is edited by Professor Carducci. The plan upon which a choice is made is the representation of Mazzini as man of letters, as social philosopher, and as prophet.

Several German and other "relations" concerning the Spanish Armada are printed in the *Mittheilungen des Instituts für oesterreichische Geschichtsforschung*, XX. 4.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: P. Sabatier, *De l'Authenticité de la Légende de Saint François dite des Trois Compagnons* (*Revue Historique*, January); S. Minocchi, *La Legenda Trium Sociorum*, II. (*Archivio Storico Italiano*, 1900, 3); A. Contento, *La Popolazione di Venezia dal 1338 al 1795* (*Nuovo Archivio Veneto*, XIX. 1, 2, XX. 1); K. Häbler, *Zur Geschichte des spanischen Kolonialhandels im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert* (*Zeitschrift für Social- und Wirthschaftsgeschichte*, VII. 4).

#### GERMANY, AUSTRIA, SWITZERLAND.

In the *Abhandlungen, Vorträge und Reden* of the late Professor Felix Stieve of Munich (Leipzig, Duncker und Humblot), the pieces of most general historical value are those on the earlier portion of Wallenstein's career, on the relations of Henry IV. to the Jülich question, and others concerning the Thirty Years' War.

The *Revue Historique* for January contains a summary review of German publications of the year 1899 in the field of modern history, by Dr. Martin Philippson.

Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice is about to publish in the form of a book those articles on the Duke of Brunswick which he, it is now known, contributed to the *Edinburgh Review* in 1897 and 1898. The title will be *Charles William Ferdinand, Duke of Brunswick; a Study in the History of the Eighteenth Century*.

In the *Deutsche Rundschau* for December Professor P. Bailieu prints some very interesting letters of Queen Louise of Prussia to her brother George.

Messrs. Harper and Brothers will shortly publish a *Life of the Emperor Frederick*, edited from the German of Margaretha von Poschinger, with an introduction by Sidney Whitman. This book is a condensation of the German original, and deals largely, if not chiefly, with the political and military sides of the Emperor's life.

At the fifth annual session of the Royal Saxon Historical Commission, December 12, it was reported that the *Lehnsbuch Friedrich's des*

*Strengeen von 1349*, ed. Lippert and Beschorner, and the *Akten und Briefe Herzog Georg's*, ed. Gess, were in press. The *Akten zur Geschichte des Bauernkriegs in Mitteldeutschland*, ed. Merx., Vol. II. of the *Politische Korrespondenz des Kurfürsten Moritz*, ed. Brandenburg, the correspondence of the Electress Maria Antonia with the Empress Maria Theresa, ed. Lippert, and the *Akten zur Geschichte des Heilbronner Bundes von 1632-33*, ed. Kretzschmar, were reported as ready for printing. It was agreed to undertake the publication of the autograph letters (and draughts) of Augustus the Strong, to be edited by Dr. P. Haake of Berlin.

The Historical Commission of Baden has in the press the fifth volume of the *Politische Correspondenz Karl Friedrich's von Baden*, ed. Obser, and Vol. II. of the *Regesten der Markgrafen von Baden*, ed. Witte. The Commission will publish an index to Vols. I.-XXXIX. of the *Zeitschrift für Geschichte des Oberrheins*.

A new commission for the publication of documents and correspondence illustrating the modern history of Austria has been instituted at Vienna by the ministry of education.

Hofrat Theodor von Sickel, founder and director of the Austrian Historical Institute at Rome, has resigned the charge of that establishment.

M. Edouard Rott's *Histoire de la Réprésentation de la France en Suisse*, of which the first volume has now been published at Paris by Alcan, will consist of nine volumes. In the first six, chronological lists of the various diplomatic agents and of the documents relating to their missions will be followed by the history of those missions and the text of many documents; the seventh and eighth will give biographies of the agents; the ninth will describe their personal life in Switzerland.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: K. Zeumer, *Zur Geschichte der westgothischen Gesetzgebung* (*Neues Archiv*, XXIV. 1); K. Wenck, *Französische Werbungen um die deutsche Königskrone zur Zeit Philipp's des Schönen und Clemens' V.* (*Historische Zeitschrift*, LXXXVI. 2); A. Götze, *Die Artikel der Bauern, 1525* (*Historische Vierteljahrschrift*, IV. 1); O. Hintze, *Der oesterreichische und der preussischen Beamtenstaat im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (*Historische Zeitschrift*, LXXXVI. 3); H. Oncken, *Grossherzog Peter von Oldenburg* (*Preussische Jahrbücher*, December).

#### NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM.

In the January number of the *Revue des Questions Historiques* Professor A. Delescluse presents a summary review of recent historical publications in Belgium.

M. Henri Pirenne, in a volume published by the Commission Royale d'Histoire de Belgique, and entitled *Le Soulèvement de la Flandre Maritime, 1323-1328*, prints a curious report of the commissioners appointed to investigate as to the property of those Flemings who took part in the

battle of Cassel. He shows that that battle was the result of a social revolt like that of 1381 in England.

Dr. W. P. C. Knuttel has published the third part of his learned and elaborate catalogue of the pamphlets in the Royal Library at The Hague. This volume covers the important years from 1689 to 1713.

#### NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE.

In the *Mémoires et Documents* published by the Société de l'École des Chartes, Vol. IV., M. F. Chalandon has presented an excellent study of Alexis Comnenos, substituting for the traditional view, and laying before the larger public, the history of that prince as already known to scholars, *Essai sur le Règne d'Alexis I<sup>er</sup> Comnène* (Paris, Picard).

Messrs. Scribners are the American agents for the Wolseley Series of war memoirs, edited by Captain Walter H. James, of which the latest issue is *Operations of General Gurko's Advance Guard in 1877*, by Colonel Epauchin of the Russian staff. The volume describes General Gurko's advance over the Balkan Mountains and the capture of the Shipka Pass.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. Gelzer, *Das Verhältnis von Staat und Kirche in Byzanz* (Historische Zeitschrift, LXXXVI, 2); Baron A. d'Avril, *La Protection des Chrétiens dans le Levant* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, 1900, 4).

#### AMERICA.

In our next two numbers we expect to print, in the section devoted to documents, a collection of interesting letters, derived from various sources, illustrating the history of the nullification controversy in South Carolina.

Messrs. Appleton and Co. have in preparation a new supplementary volume of *Appleton's Cyclopaedia of American Biography*, edited by General James Grant Wilson. The volume will cover the last twelve years, and will also contain a complete list of the pseudonyms mentioned in the preceding volumes.

Messrs. Henry Holt and Co. have published an enlarged and thoroughly revised edition of Johnston's *History of the United States*. The work of revision has been done by Professor MacDonald of Bowdoin College.

Messrs. G. P. Putnam's Sons have published *North Americans of Yesterday*, a comparative study of North-American Indian life, customs, etc., by Mr. F. S. Dellenbaugh. The volume is chiefly made up from a course of lectures given before the Lowell Institute of Boston. The author accompanied Major John W. Powell of the Bureau of American Ethnology upon the second Colorado expedition, and his book treats of the material then collected.

Messrs. Houghton, Mifflin and Co. have published as Volume XXXII. of the "American Statesmen" series a *General Index* to the series, with a

selected bibliography, both prepared, with great care, by Dr. Theodore Clarke Smith.

In the series of *Old South Leaflets* the latest issues are Lincoln's Cooper Institute Address; Choate's "Romance of New England History;" an account of the invention of the steamboat; Horace Mann's "Ground of the Free School System;" and Kossuth's first speech in Faneuil Hall, 1852.

Mr. Charles K. Bolton, librarian of the Boston Athenaeum, has published (Salem, Eben Putnam), a pamphlet entitled *Marriage Notices, 1785-1794, for the Whole United States, copied from the Massachusetts Centinel and the Columbian Centinel*.

Messrs. Joel Munsell's Sons (Albany) have published a *List of Titles of Genealogical Articles in American Periodicals*, and kindred works, giving the name, residence, and earliest date of the first settler of each family.

The Macmillan Co. will shortly publish *American Diplomatic Questions*, by Mr. John B. Henderson, Jr. The book consists of a series of essays upon the Behring Sea Controversy, the North-East Coast Fisheries, Samoa, the Monroe Doctrine, and the Negotiations relating to the Isthmian Canal.

*The Report of the Commissioner of Education for 1898-1899* contains a chapter upon the development of the common school in the Western States from 1830 to 1865, a preliminary bibliography of Confederate text-books, and a contribution to the history of normal schools in the United States.

Mr. John Lane is publishing a new edition of Sir Arthur Helps's *The Spanish Conquest in America*, edited by Mr. M. Oppenheim. The first volume has already appeared.

The Clarendon Press (New York, Henry Frowde), has just published a second series of *Voyages of the Elizabethan Seamen to America*, edited from the pages of Hakluyt by Mr. E. J. Payne. This volume contains the narratives of Gilbert, Amidas and Barlow, Cavendish and Raleigh.

Vol. LXXI. of the *Jesuit Relations* will contain a full statement of the facts relating to the portrait recently discovered in Montreal, and believed by so excellent an authority as Father Hamy of Boulogne-sur-Mer to be a genuine likeness of Father Marquette.

Dr. Francis N. Thorpe has just published *A Constitutional History of the United States, 1765-1885*, in three volumes (Chicago, Callaghan and Co.). The first volume deals with the national development during the Revolutionary War, and with the formation of the Constitution; Vol. II. covers the period from 1787 to 1861, and Vol. III. is devoted to the consideration of the problems of emancipation and suffrage.

Mr. William Abbatt, 281 Fourth Avenue, New York, announces a new edition of the *Memoirs of Major-General Heath*, to be ready May 1. This is the first republication since the original edition in 1798.

The Rev. Cyrus Townsend Brady is writing a life of Benedict Arnold and his second wife, Margaret Shippen. He would be pleased to hear of unpublished material, especially such as relates to Arnold's life in England. Mr. Brady's address is 6347 Woodbine Avenue, Philadelphia.

Professor Max Farrand of Wesleyan University has undertaken the preparation of a work certain to be highly useful to all students of our constitutional history—a critical edition of all the acts of the Philadelphia Convention of 1787, embracing both the official journal and all the unofficial notes of debates, so arranged as to permit ready reference at once to all the records of any given day, and properly supplied with scholarly annotations.

The *Records of the Catholic American Historical Society* for December prints the diary of Archbishop Maréchal, 1818 to 1825, and also a list of Spanish-American bishops from 1594 to 1600, taken from the *Acta* of the Consistorial Congregation.

*Le Communisme au Nouveau Monde*, by François Sagot (Paris, La Rose, pp. 235), is reported as a careful study of our various communistic experiments.

Mr. D. McKay (Philadelphia) has brought out a new edition of Losong's *Pictorial History of the Civil War*.

Mr. C. D. Rhodes has written a *History of the Cavalry of the Army of the Potomac: including that of the Army of Virginia* (Hudson-Kimberly Publishing Co.). The work also deals with the operations of the Federal cavalry in West Virginia.

Mr. Daniel Fish has brought out (Minneapolis Public Library), under the title, *Lincoln Literature*, a bibliographical account of books and pamphlets relating to Abraham Lincoln.

*The Autobiography of a Journalist*, by William J. Stillman (Houghton, Mifflin and Co.) will be of interest not alone because of the varied life of its subject, but also because of the number of distinguished men whose friendship Mr. Stillman possessed. Among these were Bryant, Lowell, Emerson and Agassiz, Ruskin and the Rossettis.

*The Thirteenth Annual Report of the Massachusetts Commissioner of (local) Public Records* contains a review of the colonial and state legislation concerning the public records, and an account of the state's standard ink, with formula, and standard record paper.

The January number of the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* is accompanied by a monograph of 157 pages on Massachusetts Labor Legislation, by Miss Sarah Scovill Whittelsey, Ph.D., which begins with a sketch of the history of the labor laws of that state.

Mr. S. T. Pickard has edited the letters of Whittier to Professor Elizur Wright (Boston, C. E. Goodspeed), and published them in a volume called *Whittier as a Politician*.

The *Life and Letters of Phillips Brooks*, by Professor Alexander V. G. Allen, of the Episcopal Theological School at Cambridge (E. P. Dutton and Co.) is published in two volumes of 1619 pages, the greater part of which is drawn from the letters and papers of the bishop. The result is a careful and minute study of the career of one of the greatest of American divines.

The American Antiquarian Society proposes to publish the *Diary of Librarian Christopher Columbus Baldwin, 1829-1835*, edited by Mr. Nathaniel Paine.

The January number of the *Publications* of the Rhode Island Historical Society consists almost entirely of a selection from the papers of William Vernon lent by Mrs. E. W. Blake. The papers here selected from the mass of the Vernon Papers are those illustrating the history of the Navy Board for New England, maintained by Congress during the Revolutionary War, and consisting of Vernon, James Warren of Massachusetts and John Deshon of Connecticut. They are an important series, especially in view of the paucity of our materials for the naval history of the Revolution. This number completes the eighth volume of the *Publications*. It is now contemplated that this series be discontinued, and that its place be taken by an annual volume of *Collections*, continuing the original series of *Collections* of which nine volumes were published between 1827 and 1897, but which has of late been increased only at irregular intervals.

It is understood that a third volume of the *Records of the State of Connecticut* was finished in manuscript by the late Dr. C. J. Hoadly just before his death. It is to be hoped that it will soon be printed.

The *Annual Report* of the Comptroller of the State of New York announces the completion of the work of binding, indexing, and otherwise rendering accessible, the original documents relating to the Revolutionary War which are to be found in his office. The set as bound numbers fifty-two volumes.

In the recent issues of the *Bulletin of the New York Public Library* (December-February) is printed a list of the documents and papers relating to the northeastern boundary of the United States, by Mr. A. R. Hasse; a check-list of municipal and state documents relating to New York City; a list of works concerning the financial and commercial history of the town; and a list of the maps and atlases which represent, or relate to, New York.

It is understood that the New York Historical Society hopes soon to begin the erection of one section of its proposed new building, on Central Park West, between Seventy-sixth and Seventy-seventh Streets.

There has recently been discovered in London the British headquarters' colored manuscript map of New York and environs during the period of the Revolutionary War. It shows the fortifications, defences, roads, etc., together with the harbor, islands, and river frontages on the Hud-

son and East Rivers; also the military works on Long Island and parts of the Jersey shore. A limited number of facsimile copies will be published, for subscribers only, by B. F. Stevens (London).

The Reform Club of New York City has published a *History of Tammany Hall* by Mr. Gustavus Myers.

The *History of Westchester County*, by Mr. Frederick Shonnard and Mr. W. W. Spooner (New York History Co.), contains a careful account of the early English and Dutch settlements, and is chiefly concerned with the period preceding the Revolution.

Vol. XX. of the *New Jersey Archives* is Vol. IV. of Mr. Nelson's Newspaper Extracts, extending from 1756 to 1761. A History of Printers and Printing in New Jersey prior to 1801, intended for this volume, is deferred, but will probably appear in connection with Vol. XXIII., the next volume to be devoted to newspaper extracts. It will be remembered that Mr. Nelson has heretofore brought his account of newspapers and early printing, in alphabetical order of states, down through New Hampshire. Vol. XXI. is a calendar, prepared by Mr. Berthold Fernow, of the records in the office of the secretary of state of New Jersey relating to the period 1664-1703, ending with the union of East and West Jersey. There must be six or seven thousand documents here summarized. They furnish a large body of fresh material for the student of government, land-purchases and land-grants in the Jerseys.

In the January number of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Mr. Lewis Burd Walker continues his biography of Margaret Shippen, wife of Benedict Arnold. Among the interesting documents printed is a journal kept by Col. Elias Boudinot, commissary-general of prisoners, while sojourning in the city of New York in February, 1778, looking after the welfare of the American prisoners and arranging exchanges; also letters of Rev. Percival Locke and Rev. George Craig, missionaries of the Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts, written from Lancaster, Penn., 1746-52. The annual report of the treasurer of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania shows the society to possess property to the amount of \$289,638.

*The Immigration of the Irish Quakers into Pennsylvania, 1682-1750, with their Early History in Ireland*, by Mr. Albert Cook Myers, of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania (published by the author), will shortly appear. The author has made use of printed and manuscript collections relating to his subject in Dublin, Paris and London, as well as of the Friends' Historical Library of Swarthmore College, the largest collection of Friends' books in America, and other similar material.

In the November number of the *Publications of the Southern History Association* we note a body of reminiscences of Southern frontier life in Revolutionary days, prepared about 1842 for Dr. Lyman C. Draper, by Col. William Martin, of Smith County, Tennessee, the oldest son of General Joseph Martin. The father may, in part, be regarded as the

source of the narratives; but the son, also, born in 1765, remembered the period in question. In the January issue of the same journal Mr. Ernest A. Smith, of Allegheny College, begins a valuable series of articles on the history of the Confederate Treasury.

The Virginia Historical Society reports that its catalogue of manuscripts is nearly printed. General G. W. Custis Lee has deposited with the Society a large collection of manuscripts relating to the Parke, Custis, Washington and Lee families. Major Powhatan Ellis has presented much valuable material, printed and manuscript, among the latter being a part of the papers of Governor and Senator Powhatan Ellis.

The January number of the *Virginia Magazine of History* contains some interesting letters of Harrison Gray and Harrison Gray, jr., loyalists of Boston; the usual instalment of notes from the early records of the Council and General Court; and a list of members of the House of Burgesses, supplementing and furnishing a guide to all previous lists. The Nicholson-Blair documents now published bring the affair up to the return of Blair and the recall of Nicholson; those from the McDonald collection relate to the deposition of Governor Harvey. The will of Mary Washington's mother, Mrs. Mary Hewes, is printed.

Numbers 10, 11, and 12, completing the eighteenth volume of the *Johns Hopkins University Studies*, form a study of the part played by the Baptists in the struggle for religious freedom in Virginia, by Mr. William T. Thom. A map, traced from the Lewis map which is prefixed to Jefferson's *Notes on Virginia* (1794), accompanies the volume and illustrates the growth of the Baptist churches between 1770 and 1776.

The *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* for January continues the papers of the First Council of Safety of that state, and those relating to the mission of Colonel John Laurens in Europe, 1781. The genealogical section deals with the Barnwell family.

No. 7 of the *Transactions of the Huguenot Society of South Carolina* consists mainly of an historical sketch of the Huguenot Congregations of South Carolina, by the late Daniel Ravenel, with notes by the late W. G. De Saussure (Charleston, pp. 74).

Messrs. M. F. Mansfield and Co. announce *Recollections of a Georgia Loyalist*, by Elizabeth Lichtenstein Johnston, edited by the Rev. Arthur W. Eaton.

Mr. Thomas M. Owen has been elected Director of the Department of Archives and History in the state of Alabama, which was established by an act of February 27.

The *American Historical Magazine* for October (Nashville, Tenn.) contained a body of records of Washington County, Tennessee, beginning with the establishment of the Court of Pleas and Quarter Sessions by North Carolina in 1778 and coming down to 1790, to be continued in the later issues of the magazine.

Messrs. Macmillan and Co. announce *Reconstruction in Mississippi*, a careful study, by Mr. James W. Garner, fellow in political science at Columbia University, formerly associate in history at the Bradley Polytechnic Institute, Peoria.

The Louisiana Historical Society has invited the co-operation of other historical societies in the Mississippi Valley in an effort to persuade the United States government to cause to be copied and published the most important portions of the archives of colonial Louisiana now preserved in Paris.

In the January *Quarterly* of the Texas State Historical Association the interesting reminiscences of Mrs. Dilue Harris are continued. Mr. Eugene C. Barker presents the Difficulties of an American Revenue Officer, from the papers of Captain Antonio Tenorio, who in 1835 performed that difficult office at Anahuac; Dr. W. F. McCaleb prints an account of the first period of the Gutierrez-Magee Expedition.

Numbers I. and II. of the *Publications of the Illinois State Historical Library* are, respectively, a Bibliography of Newspapers published in Illinois prior to 1860, compiled by Dr. Edmund J. James and Mr. M. J. Loveness, both of the University of Chicago, and a collection, with comment by Dr. James, of the Territorial Laws of Illinois, from 1809 to 1812.

A quarterly entitled *Deutsch-Amerikanische Geschichtsblätter* is published by the Deutsch-Amerikanische Historische Gesellschaft von Illinois (Koelling and Klappenbach), and edited by members of the society. Part I., which appeared for January, 1901, contains contributions to the history of the German pioneers of Illinois.

*Wisconsin's Deutsch-Amerikaner bis zum Schluss des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, the first volume of which, by Wilhelm H. Jensen (Milwaukee, Deutsche Gesellschaft), has just appeared, treats of the part played by the German-Americans in social and political life, and of the modifying influences upon them of their new environment. The present volume carries the history of German-Americanism to about the year 1875.

The January number of the *Annals of Iowa* contains an article on George Wilson, first territorial adjutant, by his son, George Wilson; one on Charles Mason, first chief-justice of the territorial supreme court, by Judge Emlin McClain; and one on the First Legislative Assembly in Iowa Territory, by Rev. Dr. William Slater.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Woodrow Wilson, *Colonies and Nation*, I.-IV. (Harper's Monthly Magazine, January-April); F. R. Lassiter, *Arnold's Invasion of Virginia, 1781* (Sewanee Review, January); C. J. Bullock, *Direct Taxes and the Federal Constitution*, I. (Yale Review, February); James Bradley Thayer, *A Picture of Chief Justice Marshall* (Atlantic, March).

